

# CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION TRUST FUND

---

HEARING  
BEFORE THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON  
SELECT REVENUE MEASURES  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION  
ON  
H.R. 2470

TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO PROVIDE THAT  
THE EXCISE TAX ON HANDGUNS WILL BE TRANSFERRED TO A  
TRUST FUND TO BE USED FOR PURPOSES OF PROVIDING COM-  
PENSATION TO VICTIMS OF CRIME, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

---

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
APRIL 18, 1983

---

Serial 98-16

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1983

23-781 O

H781-32

## COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, Illinois, *Chairman*

SAM M. GIBBONS, Florida  
J. J. PICKLE, Texas  
CHARLES B. RANGEL, New York  
FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, California  
JAMES R. JONES, Oklahoma  
ANDY JACOBS, Jr., Indiana  
HAROLD FORD, Tennessee  
ED JENKINS, Georgia  
RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Missouri  
THOMAS J. DOWNEY, New York  
CECIL (CEC) HEFTEL, Hawaii  
WYCHE FOWLER, Jr., Georgia  
FRANK J. GUARINI, New Jersey  
JAMES M. SHANNON, Massachusetts  
MARTY RUSSO, Illinois  
DON J. PEASE, Ohio  
KENT HANCE, Texas  
ROBERT T. MATSUI, California  
BERYL ANTHONY, Jr., Arkansas  
RONNIE G. FLIPPO, Alabama  
BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota  
BARBARA B. KENNELLY, Connecticut

BARBER B. CONABLE, Jr., New York  
JOHN J. DUNCAN, Tennessee  
BILL ARCHER, Texas  
GUY VANDER JAGT, Michigan  
PHILIP M. CRANE, Illinois  
BILL FRENZEL, Minnesota  
JAMES G. MARTIN, North Carolina  
RICHARD T. SCHULZE, Pennsylvania  
BILL GRADISON, Ohio  
W. HENSON MOORE, Louisiana  
CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, Jr.,  
South Carolina  
WILLIAM M. THOMAS, California

JOHN J. SALMON, *Chief Counsel*  
JOSEPH K. DOWLEY, *Assistant Chief Counsel*  
ROBERT J. LEONARD, *Chief Tax Counsel*  
A. L. SINGLETON, *Minority Chief of Staff*

---

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT REVENUE MEASURES

FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, California, *Chairman*

CECIL (CEC) HEFTEL, Hawaii  
FRANK J. GUARINI, New Jersey  
RONNIE G. FLIPPO, Alabama  
BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota  
BARBARA B. KENNELLY, Connecticut  
ED JENKINS, Georgia

JOHN J. DUNCAN, Tennessee  
RICHARD T. SCHULZE, Pennsylvania  
GUY VANDER JAGT, Michigan  
W. HENSON MOORE, Louisiana

JAYNE BOYLE, *Professional Staff*  
JOHN JONAS, *Professional Staff*

# CONTENTS

|                                                                  |        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| Press release of Monday, April 11, 1983, announcing hearing..... | Page 1 |
| H.R. 2470, text.....                                             | 3      |
| Description of H.R. 2470.....                                    | 5      |

## WITNESSES

|                                                                                                                                                                                                 |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Boggs, Sgt. David, Technical Services Administration Section, Chicago Police Department.....                                                                                                    | 21 |
| Bowman, Hon. Woods, Illinois State Representative.....                                                                                                                                          | 29 |
| Budde, Carolyn, Victims Family Committee, Chicago, Ill.....                                                                                                                                     | 30 |
| Chicago Police Department, Matt L. Rodriguez, Bureau of Technical Services; Katherine Kajari, Public Information Division; and Sgt. David Boggs, Technical Services Administration Section..... | 21 |
| Committee for Humane Legislation, Friends of Animals, Inc., Sandy Horwitt on behalf of Alice Herrington.....                                                                                    | 38 |
| Cook County, Ill., Office of the State's Attorney, Hon. Richard M. Daley, State's Attorney, and Eileen Springer, Victim Assistance Program.....                                                 | 15 |
| Cook County, Ill., Sheriff's Police Department, Edmund Dobbs.....                                                                                                                               | 25 |
| Craig, Evelyn, Crisis Center for South Suburbia, and Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence.....                                                                                          | 46 |
| Crisis Center for South Suburbia, Evelyn Craig.....                                                                                                                                             | 46 |
| Daley, Hon. Richard M., State's Attorney, Cook County, Ill.....                                                                                                                                 | 15 |
| Dobbs, Edmund, Sheriff's Police Department, Cook County, Ill.....                                                                                                                               | 25 |
| Friends of Animals, Inc., Sandy Horwitt on behalf of Alice Herrington.....                                                                                                                      | 38 |
| Goddard, Martha, Victims Compensation Section, Office of the Attorney General of the State of Illinois.....                                                                                     | 9  |
| Harper, Glenn, Illinois Department of Conservation and International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.....                                                                             | 26 |
| Hartigan, Hon. Neil F., Attorney General of the State of Illinois.....                                                                                                                          | 9  |
| Herbst, David, National Wildlife Federation, Illinois Wildlife Federation, Indiana Wildlife Federation, League of Kentucky Sportsmen, and Michigan United Conservation Clubs, Inc.....          | 34 |
| Herrington, Alice. (See, Committee for Humane Legislation, Friends of Animals, Inc.)                                                                                                            |    |
| Horwitt, Sandy, Committee for Humane Legislation, Friends of Animals, Inc., on behalf of Alice Herrington.....                                                                                  | 38 |
| Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence, Evelyn Craig.....                                                                                                                                 | 46 |
| Illinois Department of Conservation, Glenn Harper.....                                                                                                                                          | 26 |
| Illinois, State of, Office of the Attorney General, Hon. Neil F. Hartigan, Faith Salsburg, and Martha Goddard.....                                                                              | 9  |
| Illinois Wildlife Federation, David Herbst.....                                                                                                                                                 | 34 |
| Indiana Wildlife Federation, David Herbst.....                                                                                                                                                  | 34 |
| International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Glenn Harper.....                                                                                                                      | 26 |
| Johnson, Beth, Witness Information Service, Peoria, Ill.....                                                                                                                                    | 19 |
| Kajari, Katherine, Public Information Division, Chicago Police Department.....                                                                                                                  | 21 |
| Kulis, Chester J., Chicago, Ill.....                                                                                                                                                            | 44 |
| League of Kentucky Sportsmen, David Herbst.....                                                                                                                                                 | 34 |
| Michigan United Conservation Clubs, Inc., David Herbst.....                                                                                                                                     | 34 |
| National Wildlife Federation, David Herbst.....                                                                                                                                                 | 34 |
| Neems, Hon. Adele S., Alderman of the Third Ward of the city of Evanston, Ill.....                                                                                                              | 42 |
| Rodriguez, Matt L., Bureau of Technical Services, Chicago Police Department.....                                                                                                                | 21 |
| Russo, Hon. Marty, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois.....                                                                                                                 | 7  |
| Salsburg, Faith, Assistant Attorney General, State of Illinois.....                                                                                                                             | 9  |
| Springer, Eileen, Victim Assistance Program, Cook County, Ill.....                                                                                                                              | 15 |
| Victims Family Committee, Chicago, Ill., Carolyn Budde.....                                                                                                                                     | 30 |
| Witness Information Service, Peoria, Ill., Beth Johnson.....                                                                                                                                    | 19 |

IV

SUBMISSIONS FOR THE RECORD

|                                                                                       | Page |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Kelly, Richard F., Jr., a State Senator from Illinois, letter-----                    | 49   |
| National Rifle Association of America, J. Warren Cassidy, statement-----              | 50   |
| Parents of Murdered Children, Robert and Margaret Coombs, letter and attachment ----- | 54   |
| Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute Inc., statement--               | 57   |



## CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION TRUST FUND

MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1983

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT REVENUE MEASURES,  
*Chicago, Ill.*

The subcommittee met at 10:10 a.m., pursuant to notice, in room 2525, Everett McKinley Dirksen Federal Building, 219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., Hon. Dan Rostenkowski (chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means) presiding.

[The press release announcing the hearing, a copy of H.R. 2470, and an explanation of the bill follow:]

[Press release of Monday, Apr. 11, 1983]

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT REVENUE MEASURES, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ANNOUNCES A FIELD HEARING ON LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE COMPENSATION OF CRIME VICTIMS TO BE HELD IN CHICAGO, ILL.

The Honorable Fortney H. (Pete) Stark (D., Calif.), Chairman, Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, announces a public hearing on legislation which would provide for the transfer of the excise tax on handguns to a trust fund for the compensation of crime victims to be held on Monday, April 18, 1983, at 10:00 a.m. in the Ceremonial Courtroom, Room 2525 of the Federal Building, 219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604. Testimony will be taken from invited witnesses and interested members of the public.

The legislation being considered by the Subcommittee is sponsored by Representative Marty Russo, and is largely identical to H.R. 6115, sponsored by Mr. Russo in the last Congress.

### BACKGROUND

#### *Firearms and ammunition*

Under present law, an excise tax is imposed on the sale by the manufacturer, producer or importer of (1) pistols or revolvers, at the rate of 10 percent of the sales price, and (2) firearms (other than pistols and revolvers) or shells and cartridges, at the rate of 11 percent of the sales price (Code sec. 4181).

Exemptions from the tax are provided for (a) firearms subject to the section 5811 tax (relating to the transfer of certain nonregular firearms, such as machine guns and short barreled shotguns), or (b) sales to the military (Code sec. 4182). There are also certain recordkeeping exemptions for persons holding Federal licenses under chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code (Code sec. 4182(c)).

#### *Bows and arrows*

An 11 percent excise tax presently applies to the sale of any bow having a draw weight of 10 pounds or more, or of any arrow measuring 18 inches or more in length, or of any part or accessory or quiver suitable for use with such bows and arrows (Code sec. 4161(b)).

#### *Use of amounts appropriated*

Amounts equivalent to the excise taxes on regular firearms and ammunition and bows and arrows are transferred to the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration

Fund, and are distributed to the States in partial reimbursement of the costs they incur in various wildlife restoration and management projects.

The programs in wildlife restoration are financed by appropriation of the receipts from the 10 percent excise tax on pistols and revolvers, the 11 percent excise tax on other regular firearms and ammunition, and the 11 percent excise tax on certain archery equipment. States are reimbursed up to 75 percent of the cost of approved projects in the selection and restoration of land and water areas adaptable as feeding, resting or breeding places for wildlife, which may include research into problems of wildlife resources and management, surveys and inventories of wildlife populations, and acquisition and improvement of wildlife habitat. Funds are also available for development of hunter training and target ranges. A statutory formula determines the distribution of assistance under this program among the 50 States and District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Marianas.

#### *Proposed legislation*

The legislation proposed by Mr. Russo would provide for the transfer of the tax imposed by Code section 4181 on pistols and revolvers to a newly-created trust fund to provide compensation to victims of crime.

#### **DETAILS FOR SUBMISSION OF REQUESTS TO BE HEARD**

Individuals and organizations interested in presenting oral testimony before the Subcommittee must submit their requests to be heard by telephone to Harriett Lawler [(202) 225-3627] no later than noon, Thursday, April 14, 1983, to be followed by a formal written request to John J. Salmon, Chief Counsel, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, 1102 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515. Notification to those scheduled to appear will be made by telephone as soon as possible after the filing deadline.

It is urged that persons and organizations having a common position make every effort to designate one spokesperson to represent them in order for the Subcommittee to hear as many points of view as possible. Time for oral presentations will be limited with the understanding that a more detailed statement may be included in the printed record of the hearing. This procedure will afford more time for members to question witnesses. In order to expedite the hearing, witnesses may be grouped as panelists with strict time limitations for each panelist.

Requests to be heard must contain the following information:

1. The name, full address, and capacity in which the witness will appear (as well as a telephone number where he or his designated representative may be reached);
2. A list of any clients or persons, or any organization for whom the witness appears; and
3. A topical outline or summary of comments and recommendations.

The above information should also be incorporated in the prepared statements to be presented in person as well as those filed for the written record of the hearing.

In order to assure the most productive use of the limited amount of time available to question witnesses, witnesses scheduled to appear before the Subcommittee are required to submit 25 copies of their prepared statement on the day of the hearing.

#### *Written statements in lieu of personal appearance*

For those who wish to file a written statement for the printed record of the hearing, five copies are required and may be submitted to the Committee office, 1102 Longworth Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, by the close of business Monday, May 2, 1983. An additional supply of statements for the printed record may be furnished for distribution to the press and public if supplied to the Committee before the hearing.

98TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 2470

To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the excise tax on handguns will be transferred to a trust fund to be used for purposes of providing compensation to victims of crime, and for other purposes.

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 12, 1983

Mr. RUSSO (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. SCHEUER) introduced the following bill; which was referred jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Ways and Means

---

## A BILL

To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the excise tax on handguns will be transferred to a trust fund to be used for purposes of providing compensation to victims of crime, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That (a) subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue  
4       Code of 1954 (relating to trust fund code) is amended by  
5       adding at the end thereof the following new section:



1 "SEC. 9504. ESTABLISHMENT OF CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSA-  
 2 TION TRUST FUND.

3 "(a) CREATION OF TRUST FUND.—There is established  
 4 in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known  
 5 as the Crime Victims Compensation Trust Fund, consisting  
 6 of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the  
 7 Crime Victims Compensation Trust Fund.

8 "(b) TRANSFER OF CERTAIN TAXES.—There are  
 9 hereby appropriated to the Crime Victims Compensation  
 10 Trust Fund amounts equivalent to the taxes which are im-  
 11 posed by section 4181 on pistols and revolvers and which are  
 12 received in the Treasury.

13 "(c) EXPENDITURES FROM TRUST FUND.—Amounts  
 14 in the Crime Victims Compensation Trust Fund shall be  
 15 available, as provided by appropriation Acts, for purposes of  
 16 providing compensation to victims of crime."

17 (b) Section 3 of the Act of September 2, 1937 (16  
 18 U.S.C. 669b), is amended by striking out "sections 4161(b)  
 19 and 4181 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954" and insert-  
 20 ing in lieu thereof "section 4161(b) of Internal Revenue Code  
 21 of 1954 and any tax imposed by section 4181 of such Code  
 22 on articles other than pistols and revolvers".

23 (c) The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 98  
 24 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the  
 25 following new item:

"Sec. 9504. Establishment of crime victims compensation trust  
 fund."

1 (d) The amendments made by this section shall apply to  
 2 taxes imposed by section 4181 of the Internal Revenue Code  
 3 of 1954 after the date of the enactment of this Act.



## DESCRIPTION OF H.R. 2470

## ESTABLISHMENT OF CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION TRUST FUND AND DEDICATION OF REVENUES FROM THE EXCISE TAX ON PISTOLS AND REVOLVERS

(Prepared by the Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation, April 15, 1983)

## INTRODUCTION

The Ways and Means Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures has scheduled a field hearing in Chicago on April 18, 1983, on H.R. 2470 (introduced by Mr. Russo), which has been referred jointly to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Ways and Means. This bill would provide for establishment of a new trust fund and the transfer to the trust fund of revenues from the existing 10-percent excise tax on handguns (pistols and revolvers). Expenditures from the trust fund would be for compensation of crime victims.

The first part of this document is a brief summary of the bill. This is followed in the second part with a description of the provisions of the bill, including present law, issues, effective date, and estimated revenue effect.

## I. SUMMARY

Under present law, a 10-percent manufacturers excise tax is imposed on the sale of pistols and revolvers (handguns). Revenues from this tax, along with revenues from excise taxes on other firearms, ammunition, and bows and arrows, are dedicated to the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Fund for distribution to States to defray costs incurred by them in wildlife restoration and management projects.

The bill would establish a new trust fund, the Crime Victims Compensation Trust Fund, to be financed by revenues from the present 10-percent excise tax on pistols and revolvers. The bill would be effective with respect to taxes imposed after the date of its enactment.

## II. DESCRIPTION OF THE BILL

## PRESENT LAW

*Imposition of tax*

An excise tax is imposed on the sale of pistols and revolvers by a manufacturer or importer (Code sec. 4181). The tax is equal to 10 percent of the sales price.

A separate excise tax is imposed on the manufacture or importation of other types of "regular" firearms (i.e., rifles and shotguns) and shells and cartridges at an 11 percent rate (sec. 4181). Additionally, a making tax of \$200 per firearm and occupational and transfer taxes are imposed with respect to certain "non-regular" firearms (sec. 5811).<sup>1</sup> Non-regular firearms are defined as machine guns, short-barrelled shotguns, bombs, grenades, mines, and certain concealable weapons.

Exemptions from the tax on pistols and revolvers are provided for such weapons that have been subject to the making tax on non-regular firearms and for weapons sold to the military (sec. 4182).

*Dedication of revenues*

Revenues received from the 10-percent tax on pistols and revolvers are deposited in the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Fund, and are authorized to be appropriated to the States in partial reimbursement of the costs they incur in various wildlife restoration and management projects.<sup>2</sup>

The Fund was established in the Act of September 2, 1937 ("Pittman-Robertson" Act), which provided that amounts equivalent to the excise taxes on sporting arms and ammunition be deposited in the Fund. The Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act Amendments of 1970 (P.L. 91-503) provided for the deposit of

<sup>1</sup> The occupational taxes are \$500 per year for manufacturers and importers and \$200 per year for dealers. The transfer tax is generally \$200 per transfer, but is limited to \$5 per transfer for certain concealable weapons.

<sup>2</sup> Revenues from the excise tax on other regular firearms and ammunition and from an 11-percent excise tax on bows and arrows (and accessories) are also deposited in this Fund (16 U.S.C. 669 *et seq.*)

amounts equivalent to the tax on pistols and revolvers (beginning in fiscal year 1971). Public Law 92-558 (as amended by P.L. 93-313) added provisions for the deposit of amounts equivalent to the tax on bows and arrows (and accessories), beginning in fiscal year 1975.

The term wildlife restoration project is defined to include the selection, restoration, rehabilitation, and improvement of areas of land or water adaptable as feeding, resting, or breeding places for wildlife. Monies in the Fund may be used for acquisition of areas suitable (or capable of being made suitable) for those uses and for necessary construction to make the areas available for such purposes as well as for research into problems of wildlife management. A portion of the monies are also available for administration of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act and for development of hunter training programs and target ranges.

Revenues from numerous other excise taxes are presently dedicated to one or more special funds. These funds (and a partial list of the taxes dedicated to each) include the Airport and Airway Trust Fund (air passenger ticket and freight waybill taxes), the Highway Trust Fund (highway gasoline and diesel fuels and truck use taxes), the hazardous waste superfunds (chemicals and crude oil taxes), the Land and Water Conservation Fund (taxes on motorboat fuels), and the Dingell-Johnson Fund (fishing equipment taxes).

#### ISSUES

The primary issue is whether a new trust fund, funded with revenues from the present excise tax on pistols and revolvers, should be established to compensate crime victims.

Another issue is for what types of crimes, under what circumstances, and in what amounts should crime victims be compensated from the Trust Fund.

#### EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill would establish a new trust fund, the Crime Victims Compensation Trust Fund, in the Treasury. The new Trust Fund would be financed with revenues received from the present 10-percent excise tax on pistols and revolvers. Thus, these revenues would no longer be deposited in the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Fund.

The expenditure purposes of the Trust Fund would be prescribed in appropriation acts. This Trust Fund would be included in the trust fund chapter of the Internal Revenue Code.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE

The provisions of the bill would be effective with respect to taxes imposed after the date of the bill's enactment.

#### REVENUE EFFECT

The bill would not affect overall receipts of the Federal Government.

Revenues received from the present tax on pistols and revolvers are estimated to be \$32 million in fiscal year 1983 and \$34 million in fiscal year 1984. Actual receipts in fiscal year 1982 were \$30 million.

The following shows the present and projected excise tax revenues for the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Fund (actual for fiscal year 1982 and projected for fiscal years 1983 and 1984).

[In millions of dollars]

|                                                      | Fiscal years— |            |            |
|------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------|------------|
|                                                      | 1982          | 1983       | 1984       |
| <b>Tax source:</b>                                   |               |            |            |
| 10-percent tax on pistols and revolvers.....         | 30            | 32         | 34         |
| 11-percent tax on other firearms and ammunition..... | 65            | 84         | 91         |
| 11-percent tax on bows and arrows.....               | 8             | 8          | 9          |
| <b>Total</b> .....                                   | <b>103</b>    | <b>124</b> | <b>134</b> |

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI. The meeting will come to order.

It's a pleasure for me to be here in Chicago this morning to chair this hearing of the Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Today the subcommittee is considering H.R. 2470, legislation establishing a trust fund to provide compensation to crime victims.

It is appropriate that we are here in Chicago for this hearing since this is the beginning of National Victims Rights Week. The compensation of victims of crimes is a significant issue that has recently attracted the concern of many of the citizens of this city and, indeed, of the State of Illinois.

We are fortunate to have here with us this morning many of the concerned citizens, some of them public officials, who will share with the subcommittee their thoughts on the sensitive and important problems addressed by this legislation.

The present law imposes a 10-percent manufacturers excise tax on the sale of pistols and revolvers, including handguns.

Revenues from this tax are dedicated to the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Fund for distribution to States to defray costs incurred in wildlife restoration and management programs.

H.R. 2470 would establish a new trust fund, the Crime Victims Compensation Trust Fund, to be financed by revenues from the present 10-percent excise tax on pistols and revolvers.

Revenues from the present tax on pistols and revolvers are estimated to be \$32 million in fiscal year 1983 and \$34 million in fiscal year 1984.

H.R. 2470 is sponsored by my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, Congressman Marty Russo, who introduced an identical bill in the last Congress, H.R. 6115, and who has devoted a great deal of time and effort to this important issue.

At this time I would yield to my colleague from Illinois, Mr. Marty Russo.

#### **STATEMENT OF HON. MARTY RUSSO, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS**

Mr. Russo. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the chairman of the committee for scheduling these hearings in Chicago, and I'm pleased to have the opportunity to be here this morning with him to talk about this particular legislation, H.R. 2470.

It is important to review the way in which any tax-funded program is carried out. We must remember to raise the question: Are we making the best use of our scarce resources? The Ways and Means Committee is charged with this responsibility.

Programs funded through excise taxes do not receive the scrutiny of the appropriations process or debate each year on funding.

Our hearing today will focus on a particular excise tax, the 10-percent handgun tax, and how that money is currently spent.

Given the budgetary cuts across the board in Federal programming and the importance of allotting our funds according to reasonable priorities, I have introduced H.R. 2470, a bill which would provide for the transfer of the handgun tax from the Pittman-Robertson program



under the Fish and Wildlife Service to a trust fund for a victims of crime compensation program.

The bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for this transfer, and I stress that there are no new appropriations or taxes required. We simply take the existing tax now used for hunter and wildlife management programs and use it instead for victims of crime.

I am pleased that since my original introduction of this bill last year, it has received such favorable attention and support.

The National Association of Attorneys General adopted a supporting resolution at their annual meeting last July. The Washington Post recently endorsed it editorially, and just 3 months ago, the President's Task Force on Victims of Crime, in its final report, recommended a compensation program funded in part by the handgun excise tax.

The report states that there is little, if any, relationship between handguns and hunting or wildlife activities but that there is a substantial relationship between handguns and the commission of violent crimes.

It goes on to suggest that Congress reevaluate its priorities with regard to the use of the Pittman-Robertson funds, and I wholeheartedly agree. One of the highest priorities should be for the Congress to address adequately and fairly the problems of victims of crime in this country.

Every 24 seconds a person in the United States is a victim of a violent crime. More than 350,000 victims of rape, robbery, and aggravated assault suffer gunshot wounds.

It is hard to overestimate the fear of crime in America or calculate the real cost in terms of physical and emotional suffering.

The sad fact is that after the crime, the citizen may be victimized further by our criminal justice system. Our treatment of victims is often a mockery of justice. We make no meaningful provision for their time, their protection or their compensation, despite the fact that the success of our criminal justice system depends on the willing and patient participation of those victimized.

We ask these citizens to endure the inconvenience and the further disruption of their lives that a lengthy investigation and trial inevitably entails and leave them alone to bear the cost and trauma of the crime itself.

This is National Victims Rights Week. It deserves more than rhetoric, bemoaning the plight of the forgotten participants in our criminal justice system, and it calls for more than sympathetic words of support for those most abused by the system.

Words come easy, and victims have heard plenty of those. What must come now is action. Crime victims deserve our empathy, respect and tangible assistance.

I hope that this hearing will be the first step toward securing the funding necessary to put in place a victims of crime compensation program.

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Russo.

Our first witness certainly is no stranger to many of us who are residents of the State of Illinois and certainly is no stranger to fighting crime.

Mr. Hartigan, our attorney general, we're pleased that you joined us this morning. We're looking forward, with passage of this legisla-



tion, to a cooperative communion with the attorney general not only of the State of Illinois but all attorneys general.

With that, Mr. Hartigan, please proceed.

**STATEMENT OF HON. NEIL F. HARTIGAN, ATTORNEY GENERAL  
OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, ACCOMPANIED BY FAITH SALSBURG,  
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL; AND MARTHA GODDARD,  
CHIEF OF THE VICTIMS COMPENSATION SECTION**

Mr. HARTIGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, let me begin by saying thank you on behalf of the attorneys general across the United States, who, as Congressman Russo has pointed out, endorse wholeheartedly this resolution, to you, as the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, for your wholehearted support of the concept that's necessary throughout the 50 States, and to Congressman Russo for the imaginative and very vigorous and unique approach that he's taken to provide funds without new taxes to meet this very serious need.

I'm joined at the witness table by Martha Goddard, who serves as the chief of our victims compensation section—I mentioned earlier today that she has doubled the output of that section in the few months that she's had the assignment—and by Faith Salsburg, who is the assistant attorney general, who has worked very diligently in this area.

I'm honored to have the opportunity to submit testimony to your committee regarding H.R. 2470, introduced by Congressman Russo, to provide a Federal trust fund for crime victims through the use of the existing excise tax on handguns.

I'd like to commend you, Chairman Rostenkowski, and the other members of the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures for demonstrating your interest in the problems suffered by crime victims.

In light of the fact that yesterday marked the beginning of National Crime Victims Rights Week, I am especially honored that you have chosen Illinois as the site for today's hearing.

May I point out before beginning that Congressman Russo's legislation will help to create something that I have long advocated: a victims justice system.

I'd like now to provide you with an overview of the history of victims compensation and why it's so important for us to be here today.

**HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF VICTIM COMPENSATION**

The concept of victim compensation is not new. There has always been a need for some kind of compensation to victims in order to address three of the primary effects of victimization: Loss, pain, and anger; loss of personal possessions and of personal dignity, pain resulting from an injury or from a death, and anger because one was victimized in the first place.

For thousands of years, societies have tried to deal with these three effects of victimization in a variety of ways. Depending upon the severity of the crime involved, some societies subjected the offender to the pain of having a hand or an ear cut off. Others were put into the center of the village square and publicly taunted by village resi-

dents. Still others were simply put to death without benefit of trial, explanation or proof of their alleged deeds.

The intent of these early forms of punishment was to provide the victim and the victim's peers with a sense of retribution for the crime committed.

There was little help that could be found, however, to make up for the pain or for the loss suffered by the victim, since most of the offenders were themselves poor and did not have the means with which to pay the victim's medical treatment or to replace stolen property or money.

Therefore, many societies took it upon themselves to help the victim recover. Help was in the form of donating a chicken, loaning out a cow or helping the victim to rebuild his home. Indeed, many times a form of public entertainment resulted from a member of society having been victimized; hence, the popularity of public executions and the taunting of criminals in the public square.

This type of compensation and retribution continued for centuries and still continues in many countries today because it is assumed that by allowing the victim to vent his or her anger upon the offender, retribution will have been achieved.

With the advent of English law, however, our society began to change its methods of dealing with victims and criminals by having the State assume the responsibility for "making the victim whole" through bringing the criminal to justice. This began what we know today as the criminal justice system.

Criminals are provided with an attorney if they cannot afford their own. They are read a bill of rights, as Congressman Russo pointed out earlier today, at the time of arrest. The criminal is provided with free medical treatment, both emergency and followup.

Criminals are provided, upon incarceration, with free housing, food, clothing and, in many instances, an opportunity to earn wages, receive education, learn a trade or a skill and to receive psychological counseling.

Victims, on the other hand, are also supposed to receive assistance in the form of emergency medical treatment, evidence collection and preservation for use in court, insurance coverage to pay for property or medical loss, and public assistance funds in the event they're in a low-income bracket and cannot reimburse medical providers or sustain loss of earnings or support as a result of the crime.

In addition, over one-half of our States have some form of crime victim compensation program.

In theory, this sounds as though we are addressing the needs of victims as well as the rights of criminals. In practice, we are not.

Our intentions were honorable. We have indeed created a criminal justice system, but what we really need is a victims justice system. Let me explain.

A victim of a crime who has been injured is usually taken directly to a hospital emergency room for medical treatment. Most hospitals are now mandated to provide such services, but many victims do not have the means to pay for treatment, as Congressman Russo has pointed out. This is especially true today with the high unemployment rate. A victim may have lost insurance coverage along with the loss of a job.

If a victim does not have the resources to pay the hospital, it's customary for the hospital to do what it can to get the victim to pay the charges. This can mean employing a collection agency to hound the victim for weeks and months after the crime, and what happens more and more today is that hospitals, physicians, and others encourage victims to apply for public aid assistance in order to insure reimbursement of medical bills.

Since we no longer allow medical bills to be paid for in the form of food or goods produced, the only currency accepted is money.

What we are doing, then, is putting victims in the position of having to apply for public aid assistance, many for the first times in their lives. This is all due to the fact that they were the victim of a crime, an event that threw them over and made it impossible to stay off welfare until they could become employed or earn higher wages.

Even victims with insurance coverage have to pay a deductible, usually \$100 to \$200, before they can be reimbursed for their loss. For most people, especially those on fixed incomes, this represents a real hardship.

Is this victims' justice?

Many crimes leave a victim with a feeling of helplessness, isolation, and guilt.

Where will they find help and support to deal with these feelings?

The rape victim who is now suffering nightmares and feels afraid to be alone; the elderly woman who was brutally assaulted because she tried to hold on to her purse; the handicapped man who was beaten within an inch of his life because he ventured out for a walk in the park; the couple who have worked long and hard to create a small neighborhood business, who were robbed and beaten at gunpoint.

With the demise of the Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the reluctance or inability of private foundations and corporations to contribute to direct service programs in this area, psychological counseling for crime victims is rarely available.

Criminals receive psychological counseling as part of the criminal justice system.

Should not victims be accorded equal justice?

What can we do to correct these and other inequities?

The reason we are here today is to support one of the most important pieces of legislation in the history of victims compensation and assistance.

Congressman Russo and his colleagues have worked long and hard to produce H.R. 2470, with the important support of Chairman Rostenkowski. They have been able to create a method of funding which, in these economic times, is truly remarkable: Not imposing a new tax upon our citizens but, rather, effectively utilizing an existing tax.

This should have the positive effect of addressing concerns over where we will find the moneys needed to supplement funding of victim compensation programs and direct service agencies.

What more suitable method of funding than diverting the excise tax currently collected on the sale of handguns for use in helping to create a victims justice system?



To bring this issue closer to home, as Illinois attorney general, I have the responsibility of administering the Illinois Crime Victims Compensation Act. During 1982, the program awarded compensation to 417 victims of firearm misuse, the majority being handguns; 24 of those victims died.

The awards made through this program for victims of firearm injuries totaled \$975,000, or almost one-half of the entire, and very limited, yearly budget.

Since I took office in January of this year, we've tried to publicize the program. As a result, there has been an increase of 75 percent in the number of claims received by our office per month.

Therefore, not only can we expect to receive an increase in the number of awards we must make, but we may also find ourselves in the highly undesirable position of not having the resources to pay for those claims.

It is imperative, therefore, that we not delay in the passage of H.R. 2470. Illinois, along with all of the other States which have victim compensation programs, is going to need the resources that this legislation represents.

In the meantime, in order to make sure that Illinois has a victims justice system, I have taken several measures, the first of which was to propose new legislation that would improve the Illinois Crime Victims Compensation Act, administered by my office.

Foremost among this legislation is a bill that would, for the first time, provide compensation for a permanently disabled or fatally injured housewife who is a victim of crime.

In addition, we have a bill which would eliminate the requirement that Illinois citizens 65 years of age or older incur at least \$200 in out-of-pocket expenses in order to be eligible for compensation; a bill that would expand compensable psychological services to victims, now only received by the criminal, as I pointed out earlier; a bill that would prevent any convicted criminal from receiving compensation as a result of becoming a victim while confined in any State or local correctional facility or while on a work-release program from such facility; and a bill that would provide for a criminal penalty, class A misdemeanor, for any violation of the present statutory prohibition against the charging of fees for assisting an applicant under the Illinois Crime Victims Compensation Act.

In addition to the legislative changes, I am reorganizing the entire Crime Victims Division to make it more responsive to the needs of victims, and toward my goal of creating a victims justice system in Illinois. I plan to expand the role of the division to include a statewide task force on crime victims.

This task force will have as its priorities legislation, a bill of rights program for victims, dissemination of information on the current Crime Victims Compensation Act and resource/referral materials, along with crime prevention and speaking responsibilities.

For the first time in Illinois, we'll begin to provide victims with a voice, a necessary step in the creation of a true victims justice system.

Your efforts in this legislation will bring reality to what has only been given lip service in too many respects. We've seen held any number of press conferences and headlines about victims compensation and

victims assistance. The reality is that once the headline is over, the assistance isn't there.

When you're talking about 1,300 cases a year for the entire State of Illinois, which has thousands and thousands of felonies, then it's the traditional game, if you will, of promising something, not letting the people know the program is in existence or giving them access to it.

That isn't victims assistance. That's really a sham that damages them and causes them to lose faith in our society and our form of government.

What you've done, Mr. Chairman, as the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, is to lend the strength of your office and, frankly, the muscle that you've got in the Congress to the victims who have nobody else to speak up for them.

The support of Marty Russo's imaginative legislation, I think, is a major contribution not just here in Illinois, but to every human being who has been on the wrong end in our neighborhoods of the kind of crimes that we see too much of.

Thank you very much for listening to my testimony.

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Hartigan, I'm sure you're aware that in Washington these days, there isn't the atmosphere to create new trust funds.

I'm sure that Mr. Russo and I will be questioned, while processing this legislation, about the possibility of it becoming a runaway program.

Certainly the ultimate goal of this legislation is something with which citizens all over would agree, but we're now going through some trying times in both our budgetary process and the attempt to preserve our revenue base.

As an attorney general and representing the attorneys general, do you feel that the limitation of an annual appropriation is adequate?

Mr. Russo. In response to your question, Mr. Chairman, it's not setting up a new entitlement program.

Basically we would set up a Victims of Crime Trust Fund. The Congress would authorize and appropriate specific amounts each year out of this trust fund, so this handles the often-made criticism, that really doesn't exist, of it being a runaway entitlement program.

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI. The problem that I envision—and one must remember that we're dealing with national legislation—is that this then becomes quite a visible operation, with the attorneys general asking for constant increases in funds. I think basically the safeguard is that it's an annual appropriation.

But I'm just hoping that, should we be successful in the passage of this legislation—and one must remember it must also go through the Judiciary Committee—I think that it behooves the members of the law enforcement community to keep a pretty close eye on just how this money is being spent and to be totally accountable for the prudent operation of the management of this program.

Mr. HARTIGAN. I think your cautions are well taken, Mr. Chairman, and that really is the part that is so imaginative about Congressman Russo's approach.

In fact, these are existing dollars. As you know in the relationship we've had over the years, I've never asked for new dollars for any program, whether it be for the elderly or mental health.

I simply asked that those dollars that already have been promised actually get to the people they were designed to serve. Instead of the high expectations and the shattered hopes, take the government dollar and get it to the individual who's already been promised that dollar.

That's really what Congressman Russo has already done in this very imaginative approach that he's undertaken in this particular bill.

I would think that in your very difficult assignment as chairman, the reordering of priorities, matching our needs to our resources and defining new priorities is the single most difficult task in government today and the one that you have and are discharging so well. In that context, it's a balancing of priorities.

Here this stimulus is limited by the number of handguns in existence. The 10-percent, the 11-percent, that funds the trust fund, in fact, is a relatively fixed amount; as Congressman Russo has pointed out, no new revenue.

But it will be a catalyst to every one of the States who have been mouthing the idea of victims assistance to really meet their responsibility.

I think government functions in direct response, in many instances, to real need. We've seen abuses, but generally it's to real need.

In that sense, the opportunity for the voiceless—you've seen it, and I've seen it. We both grew up here. The example that I used were the Kukonuses, the neighborhood grocery store. They went in and they busted it up and shot them in the head.

Who could speak for them? They had no alternative. There was the emotion of the moment, but the day after or the week after, the dollars weren't there.

They're the people we hear so much about, the silent majority. The silentest majority in this country is the victims of crime.

A girl a block away from me was hit in the head with an ax and went to court six times in a series of continuances to try and do what she thought was right in the system. The family was broken, from a financial point of view, as a result of that.

There's the rape victim who, for the first time, is understanding that it doesn't have to be a permanent scar.

I can't imagine any area that has been underserved to the degree that this one has, and your support, the leverage that you have in the Congress and the imaginative leadership that Congressman Russo has undertaken for—how many felonies are there in the State; hundreds of thousands?

There's somebody at the other end of every one of them. Those are the voiceless, and this legislation begins a new day for them.

Now it's the State's responsibility to put away the press releases and deliver on the public commitments that it has made in the past.

It hasn't been done in this State. We're trying to move as quickly as we can to do that, and as far as the Judiciary Committee is concerned, I'm sure that we can be supportive there.

Chairman Rodino, through your good offices, was able to come to Illinois and to examine the attorney general's office here. We met with him 2 weeks ago in Washington, all of the attorneys general, and I'm sure we can provide testimony, if Congressman Russo feels that that's of help, in Washington before the Judiciary Committee.



We do know that the testimony of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is a lot more important than anybody else's.

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Russo?

Mr. Russo. I have no questions. Thank you.

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI. Thank you very much, Mr. Attorney General. It's always a pleasure to be in your company, and, as is your custom, you are an excellent witness. Thank you.

Mr. HARTIGAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI. State's Attorney Richard M. Daley.

Mr. DALEY. Good morning.

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. State's Attorney, for joining us this morning.

I must say that in the several years that I've been a Member of Congress and on the Ways and Means Committee, Daley's testifying before the Ways and Means Committee are not unusual.

I want to say publicly that as a citizen of this community, I'm certainly proud of the way in which you conduct yourself as the State's Attorney of Cook County.

I think that I'd be joined by the great majority of the citizens of this county in congratulating you on the diligence and the commitment that you have shown, the work that you've done on behalf of the citizens of this community, and the manner in which you have always conducted yourself.

So, Mr. State's Attorney, I'm pleased to have you join us this morning. It's always a pleasure, and I'm sure it's going to be educational to have you as a witness.

**STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD M. DALEY, STATE'S ATTORNEY,  
COOK COUNTY, ILL., ACCOMPANIED BY EILEEN SPRINGER, DI-  
RECTOR, VICTIM ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**

Mr. DALEY. Thank you very much, Chairman Rostenkowski, Congressman Russo.

I'd like to introduce Eileen Springer to my left, who is the director of the Victim Assistance Program for the State's attorney's office.

I'm pleased to appear today before the Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures of the House Ways and Means Committee to testify on behalf of H.R. 2470, introduced by Congressman Russo.

As you know, Congressman Russo's measure would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the 10-percent Federal excise tax now collected on the sale of handguns be transferred to a trust fund for the purpose of providing compensation to victims of crime.

It is appropriate that testimony on this legislation be taken during National Victims Rights Week, when the plight of crime victims and their essential help in bringing criminals to justice receive special notice.

Both elements—the hardships borne by the crime victims and the witnesses and the importance of bringing criminals to justice—were illustrated vividly last week in Los Angeles. You may have read the story.

Two people were killed and 11 others suffered gunshot and knife wounds at a christening party in the presence of at least 34 witnesses.

Because of the reluctance of these 34 witnesses to testify in court, the murder charges against the five accused gang members were dismissed.

Perhaps no recent example better illustrates the importance of crime victims and witnesses willing to come forward and cooperate with law enforcement in bringing criminals to justice. Fortunately, this extreme example is the exception, rather than the rule.

Indeed, there has been a growing recognition throughout this country that the criminal justice system has too often failed to meet the needs of the innocent victims of crime.

It is a familiar story: hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent for the benefit of criminals for their legal assistance, for their lawsuits in the Federal or State Courts, for counseling and treatment programs, for more comfortable prison facilities and for education and job training.

But only a tiny fraction of that amount is spent on the innocent persons who are victimized by criminals.

Fortunately, this is beginning to change. Thirty-six States, including the State of Illinois and the District of Columbia, have established crime victim compensation programs.

Many local criminal justice agencies run programs to assist and support victims of violent crime throughout their contact with the criminal justice system.

For example, in just 2 years, with the help and support of the Cook County Board, the Cook County State's attorney's office victim witness assistance services have been expanded from a skeleton two-person project to a program to assist crime victims and witnesses in every felony trial courtroom and most preliminary hearing courtrooms in Cook County.

Eileen Springer, who is with me today, directs this program with a full-time staff of 15 persons.

We have also developed an innovative program in our juvenile division where college students spend a semester assisting many of the individuals who are victimized by juvenile crime every year in Cook County.

Where we cannot provide needed counseling or other specialized services, we refer the victim or witness to an agency that can.

Because of this subcommittee's special interest today in crime victims compensation, I will focus on our office's work to help crime victims receive compensation under the Illinois Crime Victims Compensation Act.

This law provides for payment for medical and hospital expenses, loss of earnings up to \$750 per month, funeral and burial expenses up to \$2,000 and loss of support. The total recovery cannot exceed \$15,000.

There is one other critical—but often overlooked—requirement for compensation: cooperation with law enforcement agencies. This requirement reflects the recognition of each individual's responsibility to the criminal justice system and to society to work to see that the guilty are punished.

In the 18-month period from June 1981 through December 1982, the Cook County State's attorney's office assisted 2,100 individuals who cooperated in prosecution and sought compensation for financial losses of the kind covered by the act.

These included: a man whose medical bills for complications after being shot totaled \$30,000.

A woman who needed extensive oral surgery after being beaten, which was not covered by public assistance.

An 80-year-old robbery victim who was beaten with his own cane and suffered recurring medical complications.

And several relatives of murder victims who had no insurance or money to cover funeral expenses.

The members of this subcommittee might well ask why new Federal funding is needed for victim compensation if States like Illinois are already doing the job.

There are two reasons: First, as we continue to do a better job of informing victims of their right to compensation and of improving the machinery to process claims, the program is becoming so expensive that we may soon reach the point where the State of Illinois is unwilling to provide these additional funds.

Because of the State's severe financial problems—we all know about that—a major expansion of funding for victim compensation is unlikely, and this is true in many other States as well.

Second, because of limited resources, the Illinois program imposes restrictions on compensation which result in greater hardship to victims of crime.

In Illinois every victim except senior citizens, no matter how poor, must pay the first \$200 of expenses. Moreover, no matter how much income is lost by a victim, only \$750 per month will be covered by the State. Finally, no award can exceed \$15,000, even if medical expenses far exceed that amount.

These are all limitations dictated by scarce resources, and they can result in great injustices to victims.

It is an injustice for a poor person to have to pay \$200 toward the funeral expenses of an innocent child who is murdered by a street gang.

It is an injustice for a person to lose a month's salary of \$1,500 while recovering from a beating and receive only \$750 compensation from the State.

It is an injustice for an innocent victim to have to pay thousands of dollars in medical bills—beyond the maximum award of \$15,000—as a result of complications from a shooting.

Let me give you an example of how strict limitations in victim compensation result in hardship and injustice.

Members of my staff have been assisting a young woman who was a victim of a particularly brutal crime. In her apartment, this woman was raped, wrapped in a blanket, beaten over the head with a hammer and a piggy bank and the blanket set on fire.

The victim was in a coma for several weeks following the attack and eventually lost the toes on both feet. She now has difficulty simply walking. The victim's mother left her job to take care of her daughter and her daughter's young child.

In a more just system, the State's compensation program would have covered the cost of a homemaker or the victim's mother's lost wages. But in Illinois, because of limited resources, these are not compensated expenses.



The great promise of Congressman Russo's bill is that it will allow us to better acknowledge the importance of victim cooperation for more effective law enforcement and to reduce the hardships of innocent victims in cases where we cannot now afford to do so.

I maintain that the accomplishment of these goals more than justifies the loss of some funds for wildlife management purposes.

To those who would place the priorities the other way around, I invite them to join those of us who work in the criminal justice system and witness first-hand the ravages of crime.

It is fitting that handguns, which inflict untold injury and death on people—not trees and wildlife, but people—provide some small measure of compensation for the physical injuries of victims of violent crime.

Thank you for your attention. I welcome any questions you may have.

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI. Thank you very much, Mr. State's Attorney.

Mr. Russo?

Mr. Russo. Mr. State's Attorney, do you think that an expanded victims of crime program would help you in gaining more assistance in the fight against crime?

Mr. DALEY. I think it would greatly assist the fight against crime. I believe there must be some limitation.

First of all, there must be matching funds from the State. It already has a program.

Second, realistically, there must be some limitations, whether it's medical bills and wages, in the funding of a program like this, but this would greatly assist in the criminal justice system.

Mr. Russo. I just can't help but echo the comments you made on page 2, in which you point out that we spend so many hundreds of millions of dollars for the benefit of criminals, and yet when it comes time to spend dollars for victims of crime, we have more stumbling blocks, more roadblocks put in our way.

Without those individuals testifying and cooperating with us, we wouldn't be able to have a successful criminal justice system at all, so I compliment you for your statement.

Mr. DALEY. It's kind of a sad comment to say that when someone becomes a victim of crime, from the time of, say, the arrest of the criminal, we sentence someone for 10 years in the Illinois prison system for, say, an armed robbery or a rape, and they're out in 2½ or 3 years. That's what's happening.

By the time people testify in the case—say, it's a year, maybe it's less—by the time the criminal spends his time at county jail and by the time the people get all their compensation, that person is walking out.

Mr. Russo. And sometimes the victim still hasn't recovered from the injury.

Mr. DALEY. That's right.

Mr. Russo. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. State's Attorney, you and the attorney general have described some brutal crimes.

Are these drug-related?

Mr. DALEY. Many of them are drug-related, but most of them are just the ordinary course of living in a society where that happens every day, whether it's a rape or an armed robbery or a murder.

Many of them are drug-related, but many are just violent crimes that appear in our society.

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI. I had the opportunity to visit the Caribbean area recently, because the committee was working on a tax and trade initiative for countries in the Caribbean.

It was quite evident to us that drug traffic is a main operation out of the islands. There certainly is the sentiment now in Washington to take action with respect to the movement of drugs, possibly by further restricting entry at our port authorities.

Certainly Chicago is not any different than any major metropolitan area, and it's been quite apparent to us that we ought to do something about the source of the drugs, that is, where they are grown in almost a free-market environment.

I just wondered whether or not, in most instances where a person is beaten with a hammer or hit with an ax, one could, and almost would want to, conclude that this is a person that's not mentally balanced or that is, at the time of the incident, on some narcotic.

I want to say to you, Mr. Daley, that I'm very sincere about how proud I am of the way that you're conducting yourself as a public official.

I think that the county is well served by your responsible manner, in contrast to the flamboyant style that one could very well have adopted in a prosecutorial office.

With that, if Mr. Russo has concluded, I would like to thank you very much for joining us this morning.

Mr. DALEY. Thank you very much.

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI. Miss Beth Johnson.

Welcome to the committee, Miss Johnson. We're looking forward to your information.

If you're ready, please identify yourself and then the committee will be ready to proceed.

#### **STATEMENT OF BETH JOHNSON, DIRECTOR, WITNESS INFORMATION SERVICE, PEORIA, ILL.**

Ms. JOHNSON. My name is Beth Johnson from Peoria, Ill., director of Witness Information Service. We are the exemplary project for victim/witness services.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to be here before you today.

Victim witness programs are needed. Victims and witnesses need the information, support and problem-solving assistance given to them by these programs.

Without any assistance, witnesses tend not to want to get involved with the system past the police interrogation stage. As we all know, without the cooperation of a victim, the State cannot prosecute its criminals.

Victim/witness programs are also instrumental in transforming a distraught victim into a witness who is able to testify in court. This is

done through support and counseling offered. We concentrate on assuring the victims that they are the most important cog in the process.

One of the most important services a victim program can offer is to act as a liaison for the victim and witness with the court system.

This enables the victim to go back into society with a better perspective on the criminal justice system, rather than confirming their fear and anguish that is normally associated with the system.

Unfortunately, we have been made to fill a void that has been created in the system. Many times prosecution and defense counsel become too result-oriented, without being conscious of the human needs of the victim. They tend to concentrate on either getting the defendant convicted or acquitted.

It is then our job to show the victim that there is a humanistic side of the system. In order for the victim's financial losses resulting from random criminal activity not to render a second victimization, we educate the victim of the possibilities of either offender restitution or Illinois crime victims compensation.

We also try to alleviate any unnecessary anxiety by keeping the victim informed well in advance of each necessary step in the criminal justice system for the prosecution.

In order for us to continue to provide this necessary service, it is imperative that legislators recognize the need for funding and additional legislation to help the victim and to insure our service as a liaison between criminal activity and the criminal justice system.

Without commenting on the philosophy or the merits of this legislation so far as the transfer of funds is concerned, we support any Federal legislation that will help fund local victim witness programs.

I welcome any questions.

[The prepared statement follows:]

**STATEMENT OF BETH JOHNSON, WITNESS INFORMATION SERVICE, PEORIA, ILL.**

The costs of crime have to be measured not only in dollars and cents, but also in terms of the human misery caused by the involvement in a criminal act.

In the American system of criminal justice, the victim is the forgotten one. Our laws protect the rights of the criminal offender, but offer minimal protection or support to the victim, who the system is sworn to serve. The irony of this injustice is the obvious fact that victims and witnesses are as crucial to the procedures of the criminal justice system as the police, attorneys, and judges. The public is conscious of the criminal and the brutal crime, but seldom concerns itself with the plight and healing process (both mental and physical) of the victim and the victim's family.

This deplorable situation begins even before the law becomes involved. The offender decides what crime to commit and whom to victimize; the victim has no voice in this decision. The police are required by law to respect specific rights of offenders. The courts also must acknowledge and uphold the rights of the person on trial. In most instances, the victim does not even have a victim/witness program to rely on for the much needed emotional and financial support. The victim is thrown into the criminal justice system confused, not knowing what procedure to follow.

The victim may be summoned to appear over and over again, losing pay, only to find that the case has been postponed. He/she may have to repeat his/her story endlessly, confront the attacker, re-live the crime, spend days in court or simply wonder "what happened" if the case never comes to trial.

Of course, I have mentioned only a few problems experienced by victims of crime, primarily those that stem from the workings of the criminal justice system itself. It should be sufficient to show that the system, in all its facets—courts and prosecution, probation and parole, as well as police—is largely insensitive to victims' problems. The justice agencies proceed in all good faith to



do "their job" relating to the offender and to society's interest in the offense, only to re-victimize the victim in the process.

A victim advocate program could extend a helping hand to victims who, for the most part, are ignorant of what services or funds are available, are unfamiliar with bureaucratic procedures necessary to secure financial assistance, and are usually too traumatized to know how to even begin to cope with their dilemma. Victim services help bridge the gap between the victim and the resources, and, at last, make the victim a legitimate recipient of needed services rather than a stepchild who, heretofore, has only suffered at the hands of the criminal justice system.

As the director of a victim/witness program in Peoria, Illinois, I have seen many such injustices. Our program of emotional support, information, and problem solving resources for victims and witnesses of crime was designated by the federal government as the only victim/witness project to achieve the title of Exemplary Project. We have proven our service to be cost efficient and effective in increasing the participation of victims and witnesses in the court process, therefore strengthening the criminal justice system. Yet every year we struggle to have our small budget approved.

Victim/witness programs all over the country are experiencing the same difficulty. Some are simply closing their doors due to lack of funding. It costs approximately \$30,000 to incarcerate only one person for a year; in many cases this sum could fund an entire victim/witness program for the same amount of time.

The federal government has a bill of rights for convicted persons and supplies funding for many rehabilitative programs for such people—why not similar support for the victims of crime?

Members of society need and should have a means by which to understand and work with the criminal justice system before they are required to become witnesses. The efforts and services given by programs such as Witness Information Service provide the first step towards forming a stronger bond between the people and the court system. We ask for your help in continuing to realize this goal.

Mr. Russo. What can we do to better inform victims of the basic rights they have under the State law?

Ms. JOHNSON. By having more services available. In Illinois, I believe there are only 13 victim/witness programs. There just are not enough people out there to inform the victims.

Mr. Russo. How many cases do you handle in a year?

Ms. JOHNSON. We have approximately 6,000 victim/witnesses come through our office a year. Our county has 199,000 people.

Mr. Russo. How is your program funded?

Ms. JOHNSON. Currently we're funded through the county and through private donations.

Mr. Russo. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Mr. Matt Rodriguez, deputy superintendent of police of Chicago, and Kathy Kajari, director of news affairs, Chicago Police Department.

Mr. Rodriguez, you can identify yourself for the record and who is with you and proceed.

**STATEMENT OF MATT L. RODRIGUEZ, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT, BUREAU OF TECHNICAL SERVICES, CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT, ACCOMPANIED BY KATHERINE KAJARI, DIRECTOR OF NEWS AFFAIRS, PUBLIC INFORMATION DIVISION; AND SGT. DAVID BOGGS, TECHNICAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION SECTION**

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. My name is Matt Rodriguez. I am deputy superintendent in the Bureau of Technical Services of the Chicago Police Department.

To my left is Director Kathy Kajari, who is director of news affairs of the Chicago Police Department, and to my right is Sgt. David Boggs, technical services administrative section.

I'd like to begin by stating that Superintendent Brzeczek is extremely grateful to the committee in that it has provided the Chicago Police Department with an opportunity to address its views on the legislation proposed by you, Representative Russo, which would provide for transfer of the excise tax on handguns to a trust fund for the compensation of crime victims.

We, as members of the law enforcement community, are intimately acquainted with the fact and ramifications of criminal victimization.

During 1981, there were 1,321,906 violent crimes that occurred in the United States. Firearms were used in 63 percent of the murders, 40 percent of the robberies, and 24 percent of the aggravated assaults. From 1977 through 1981, aggravated assault with a firearm increased by 25 percent.

At the local level, our perspective on the personal, social, and economic consequences of criminal victimization is acute. In the period 1980 through 1982 in Chicago, firearms were used in 61.3 percent of the cases in which 2,408 persons were murdered.

Handguns were used in 42.5 percent of these cases. During the same period, firearms were used in 7,795 cases of aggravated assault.

In the professional management of these events, we constantly witness the insidious erosion of physical health, personal welfare, and economic self-determination that are the results of criminal victimization.

While the commission of a violent act against an individual by a stranger is probably one of the greatest causes of fear, its occurrence is relatively infrequent.

Yet, the acquisition of a weapon for the purpose of protecting one's home for self-defense is based on the assumption that private weapons ownership is a deterrent to crime or violence.

An interesting fact that appeared in the Federal Bureau of Investigation's 1981 publication entitled "Crime in the United States" was that 55 percent of the murders in this country were perpetrated by relatives or friends acquainted with the victims.

The paradox of this situation is that a firearm purchased to protect against an attack by some stranger very often ends up being used against members of the immediate family, relatives, friends, or acquaintances.

Thus, even when citizens who are generally law abiding seek to arm themselves for protection, there is a cost to be paid.

While the causes of crime are quite complex, the role that firearms—and, in particular, handguns—play in contributing to violent crime in the United States has been clearly documented.

Medical expenses incurred by those who commit crimes are, for the most part, routinely paid by governmental agencies. The use of the moneys collected from taxing the sale of handguns and ammunition can be used to provide this same remedy to crime victims.

In times of a depressed economy, the need for assistance is paramount because of the inability of some victims to pay for their medical expenses or obtain such funds from a third-party payer because the victims are unemployed.

However, the inability of crime victims to pay medical expenses attendant to their victimization is not singularly related to periods of high unemployment.

Because many inner-city residents lack the necessary formal education and employment skills to avail themselves of employment opportunities, they are, for the most part, economically disadvantaged.

When you add substandard housing, broken families, availability of hard drugs, and high population density to the apparent easy accessibility of firearms, the conditions which foster frustration and lead to violent crime are readily apparent.

Since the incidence of violent crime impacts to a greater degree on the less fortunate members of our society, it is essential that funds be made available to ameliorate the suffering experienced by victims of violent crime.

The personal tragedies that arise from criminal victimization are manifest and compelling. The Chicago Police Department endorses this legislation and urges its speedy implementation.

Mr. Russo. Thank you very much, Mr. Rodriguez. I have one question for you.

The enactment of a crime victims compensation program on the Federal level—how would that help the Chicago Police Department in getting assistance from witnesses in the ongoing investigations?

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. First of all, Congressman, I'm sure you're aware of the complexity of the legal procedures and the requirement that the victim attend court sometimes seven or eight times in the future.

Only even the knowledge that there will be some compensation for the wrong that was done to them will be an encouraging factor and probably keep the interest of the victim so that we can, in fact, have him as a witness when it's time for the court case to be presented.

In that sense, it will be a positive effect.

Second, there is an indirect effect, Congressman, in a morale sense.

Quite often, police officers respond to these violent crime situations. They have feelings which sometimes they have to suppress for the victim.

They have the knowledge that there is a likelihood that the perpetrator will not be found or, if found, that he will probably receive some punishment, yet there will be no compensation to the victim.

If a police officer at least can be aware of the fact that the victim has someplace to look for compensation, that there will be something to ameliorate this wrong that has occurred to him in this particularly violent situation, that is an indirect positive effect.

Mr. Russo. I can't agree with you more.

Let me ask you this: One of the comments that the Attorney General had mentioned was a lack of knowledge by victims that a program does exist.

What has the Chicago Police Department done to inform victims of certain rights that now exist under current law?

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Congressman, we made it a part of our procedures to make sure that victims of violent crimes are informed.

Immediately upon their reporting to us the fact of the crime, we let them know about the Illinois crime victims assistance program.

We give them an R.D. number, which is a number, our records number, which will help them establish the fact that the crime occurred,



and a copy of this report, the necessary information is provided in each and every instance.

Mr. RUSSO. Ms. Kajari, you may proceed.

MS. KAJARI. My name is Katherine Kajari. I'm director of news affairs for the Chicago Police Department.

I'm not here in relation to my official position. I'm here as a victim of a crime myself.

Although the crime seems small in relation to violent crime, a smash-and-grab, I still would like to give testimony as to the emotional impact that this crime had upon me.

I've been a police officer for the past 10 years, trained in the crimes as far as how they occur.

Last February 25, I was returning to the police headquarters building after attending a meeting on the West Side, and I was stopped in traffic when the crime of smash-and-grab occurred.

It's a fairly well-publicized crime, but in case anyone wants to know, that's the breaking of a window, usually on the passenger's side of the automobile, and the taking of personal property from that seat or from the floor. In this case, it was my purse.

When the window began to crack and I heard that sound, I knew exactly what was happening, what was going to happen, but I felt I really was powerless to stop it because things happened so fast.

Immediately after, a great anger built up inside of me, and although the person was subsequently caught and is now within the criminal justice system itself, that anger took about a good 10 days to subside.

Immediately after the crime, I was willing to bend anyone's ear for 1 hour, 1½ hours, as long as they'd have the patience to listen to me.

Right after the crime occurred, I was told by some police officers that have dealt with victims of this type of crime before that I would be suffering nightmares, perhaps some nighttime disturbances, and that was true. I woke up to find myself thrashing about, disturbing my husband, and yelling quite loudly. Also, they told me that these nightmares would gradually subside, if that's what they were, and they have.

My anger has been internalized now, although I will still give anyone a good 15-minute dissertation of the anger that I felt after that crime occurred.

The resulting feeling that was left with me is that I am very apprehensive about even getting into the car, particularly alone. I go through an entire ritual, such as putting my purse in the trunk and any other items that I feel will be of value.

I feel vulnerable now in the automobile, whereas before I felt that that was my area of safety that was not admissible to anyone, and it was a violation of my emotions and a violation of a little bit of my psyche that an individual would broach that area that I thought was very safe for me to be in.

So the emotional impact—and this was merely a property crime. I was not injured. The emotional results that I felt were quite severe, just trying to wind down after this crime occurred.

The one positive note is that after being the victim of a crime like this and being a police officer, the empathy now that I feel to victims of crime, particularly violent crime, is much greater, and I think I can

a little bit better now understand the resulting impact that they must suffer after being the victim of a violent crime.

Mr. Russo. Thank you, Kathy. I can sympathize with you as a former State's attorney with experience talking to victims. You can feel it just by talking to somebody about it.

Mr. Rodriguez, on the information form that you give these victims, does it state the actual procedure that they have to go through to apply for the compensation?

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. It does, Congressman. It also lists the telephone number of the attorney general's office of the State of Illinois.

One thing further, if I may, is I see the appropriateness of designating these moneys for victims of crime.

I would like to conclude by saying to you that the statistics indicate that one gun is sold every 13 seconds, and apparently a gun injures an individual every 2½ minutes and, in fact, takes a life every 20 minutes.

It is the second leading cause of unnatural death in this country, and I think it's very appropriate that these funds be made available to victims of violent crimes.

Mr. Russo. Thank you very much. We appreciate your testimony.

Our next witness is Edmund Dobbs, chief of the sheriff's police, Cook County, Ill.

Mr. Dobbs, identify yourself for the record.

**STATEMENT OF EDMUND DOBBS, CHIEF OF THE SHERIFF'S POLICE  
DEPARTMENT, COOK COUNTY, ILL.**

Mr. DOBBS. Edmund Dobbs, chief of the Cook County Sheriff's Police Department.

Mr. Congressman, I'm representing Sheriff Elrod this morning, who is unable to attend because he's had to attend a meeting in Boulder, Colo. He did ask me to express his support for your legislation, and I'd just like to make a few comments of my own.

From the police point of view, handguns have little or no sporting value. They're manufactured and used primarily to kill human beings. We have certainly witnessed the fact that we do an excellent job of killing human beings in this country. We've killed more people with handguns than we've lost in all the wars that this country has fought. Certainly we've maimed and permanently injured untold hundreds of thousands of human beings through the use of handguns, so it's fitting that we use the existing excise tax to compensate some of these victims of crimes.

The witness and victim of criminal activity are the only people that I view as being penalized for supporting our criminal justice system. They suffer physical harm. They suffer loss of wages. They suffer the loss of loved ones. They're forced to appear in our criminal justice system without any kind of compensation. I believe it is very unjust and unfair, and certainly your legislation would go a long way toward correcting this.

Mr. Russo. Thank you very much, Mr. Dobbs, and give my best to Sheriff Elrod.

Mr. DOBBS. I shall.

Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. Russo. Our next witness is Glenn Harper, from the Illinois Department of Conservation and the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

Mr. Harper, please identify yourself for the record.

**STATEMENT OF GLENN HARPER, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR NATURAL RESOURCES, ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION, ALSO REPRESENTING THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES**

Mr. HARPER. My name is Glenn Harper. I'm associate director of the Illinois Department of Conservation, and I'm also here representing the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

The International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies is composed of fish and wildlife agency members from each of the 50 States, Puerto Rico, 7 Canadian provinces, and a governmental unit in Mexico.

The association also has associate members who are likewise dedicated to conservation, protection and management of wildlife and natural resources.

The Illinois Department of Conservation is a member in good standing of the International Association.

The following resolution, entitled "Proposed Diversion of Pittman-Robertson Funds for Purposes other than Original Intent," was adopted by the International Association at their annual meeting held last September.

It reads, "Whereas funds derived from a Federal manufacturers' excise tax finance a significant part of wildlife restoration and management programs in the States;

"Whereas the Pittman-Robertson Act was amended to provide for hunter education and wildlife management programs through a re-dedication of a long-standing manufacturers tax"—rather than reading all of these, basically it indicates that they were opposed to the tax because it takes money out of the support of various wildlife restoration programs as well as hunter education.

Rather than read the remainder of the IAFWA resolutions, I have provided written copies of this information for the written record.

There are few people who are opposed to the concept of aiding victims of violent crime.

However, the International Association does not agree that funds should be diverted from programs used to manage, enhance, and restore fish and wildlife resources and, also, to support hunter education.

As you know, wildlife habitats have been disappearing at a very alarming rate across the country, and the corresponding effect of the disappearance of habitat has certainly been felt on wildlife populations.

The conservation movement in this country feels that we need every dollar available through the existing Pittman-Robertson program to continue our important responsibility for the wise use of the Nation's natural resources.

Since 1937, the Pittman-Robertson Act has served as a self-imposed excise tax on sportsmen to assure the perpetuation and enhancement of



natural resources throughout this country. These funds are used effectively by the respective States through well-documented Federal guidelines.

In fiscal 1981, \$83.4 million were allocated to the States, and there was a reversion of only \$981,000. In fiscal 1982, out of \$116 million allocated there was a reversion of only \$742,000.

A less than 1 percent reversion rate of allocated funds over the past 2 fiscal years is indicative of the vital importance this existing funding mechanism plays to the respective 50 States.

To permit any diversion of Pittman-Robertson funds, as proposed in Congressman Russo's bill, would be a great disservice to the conservation of the United States.

The International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies strongly opposes H.R. 2470 and feels that it should be defeated to assure the integrity of the existing Pittman-Robertson program.

[The prepared statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF GLENN HARPER, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR NATURAL RESOURCES,  
ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

Mr. Chairman, and other members of the Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures of the Committee on Ways and Means of the U.S. House of Representatives: My name is Glenn Harper and I am representing the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and the Illinois Department of Conservation at this hearing.

The International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies is composed of fish and wildlife agency members from each of the fifty states, Puerto Rico, seven Canadian provinces, and a governmental unit in Mexico. The Association also has associate members who are likewise dedicated to the conservation, protection and management of wildlife and natural resources. The Illinois Department of Conservation is a member in good standing of the International Association.

The following resolution entitled "Proposed Diversion of Pittman-Robertson Funds for Purposes Other Than Original Intent" was adopted by the International Association at their annual meeting held last September:

Whereas, funds derived from a federal manufacturers' excise tax finance a significant part of wildlife restoration and management programs in the States;

Whereas, the Pittman-Robertson Act was amended to provide funds for hunter education and wildlife management programs through a rededication of a long-standing manufacturers tax;

Whereas, HR 6115 and HR 6448 would divert a portion of proceeds from excise taxes on handguns to another fund to compensate victims of crime;

Whereas, such diversion of funds would severely impact on the States' abilities to continue hunter education and wildlife management programs: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, that the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies opposes any diversion of excise taxes on firearms, archery equipment or other sporting goods, such as that proposed by HR 6115 and HR 6448, to uses other than the restoration and management of our wildlife resources, and the providing of training in hunter education.

Furthermore, another resolution was acted upon by the Executive Committee of the IAFWA last month and reads as follows:

Whereas, funds derived from federal manufacturers' excise taxes finance a large part of the wildlife restoration and management activities of states through the Pittman-Robertson Program;

Whereas, these Pittman-Robertson funds also support state hunter education programs that have enviable records in preventing accidental death and injury;

Whereas, the President's Task Force on Victims of Crime has recommended that the manufacturers' excise tax on handguns be redirected from the Pittman-Robertson Program to compensate crime victims;

Whereas, such a diversion would cost state wildlife conservation more than \$22 million each year and hunter education more than \$7 million annually, thereby seriously crippling those vital programs: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, that the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies opposes the Task Force recommendation, any other recommendation, and any subsequent legislation that would divert excise taxes on firearms, ammunition, archery equipment or any sporting goods to uses other than for the restoration and management of wildlife resources, and for hunter education programs.

Few are opposed to the concept of aiding victims of crime. However, the IAFWA does not agree that funds should be diverted from programs used to manage, enhance, and restore our wildlife resources and to support hunter safety education. As you know, wildlife habitats have been decreasing at an alarming rate throughout the nation in recent years and wildlife populations have suffered accordingly. The conservation movement in this country feels that we need every dollar available through the existing Pittman-Robertson program to continue our important responsibility for the wise use of our nation's natural resources.

Since 1937 the Pittman-Robertson Act has served as a self-imposed excise tax on sportsmen to assure the perpetuation and enhancement of natural resources throughout this country. These funds are used effectively by the respective states through well-documented Federal guidelines. In Fiscal Year '81 \$83.4 million were allocated to the states and there was a reversion of only \$981,000. In Fiscal Year '82 out of \$116 million allocated there was a reversion of \$742,000. A less than one percent reversion rate of allocated funds over the past two fiscal years is indicative of the vital importance this existing funding mechanism plays to the respective fifty states. To permit any diversion of the Pittman-Robertson fund as proposed in Congressman Russo's bill would be a great disservice to the conservation movement of the United States. The International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies strongly opposes this legislation and feels it should be defeated to assure the integrity of the existing Pittman-Robertson program.

Mr. Russo. Thank you very much, Mr. Harper.

Isn't it true that in Illinois in recent years, no Pittman-Robertson funds have been used to acquire land, which is one of the main purposes behind the Pittman-Robertson program?

Mr. HARPER. As recently as 2 years ago, we used approximately \$500,000 of that money to purchase Turkey Bluffs, which is a new conservation area in the southeastern part of Illinois.

Mr. Russo. If I'm not mistaken, last year there was a reversion from Illinois of about \$261,000. Is that accurate?

Mr. HARPER. I believe that's a little bit high.

We did have a reversion, and I'm the first to admit that. There are a variety of complications in being able to expend those funds in an expedient sort of manner.

To begin with, some of this is through contracts for research, and those are overestimated or underestimated. Those of land acquisition cannot meet certain target frames, particularly if you have to go into condemnation.

Mr. Russo. Does the State of Illinois, through the Department of Conservation, contract with any nonprofit or private organization, like the Wildlife Federation or the Illinois Rifle Association, to operate or run any target-shooting ranges or hunter-training programs funded through the Pittman-Robertson program?

Mr. HARPER. Illinois has chosen not to get into the shooting range business. We feel that that is an entitlement of the program, but we wish not to take advantage of it.

The reason for that is we feel the money is more prudently spent in the development of habitat or land acquisition.

Within the past 2 years, we did fund some portion of money to a shooting range at Eastern Illinois University.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This was our first effort into that program, and the reason we did it in that case is that they had built a shooting range. They had a problem with lead poisoning because of a ventilation system, and the only reason we spent moneys from this program was for the public safety of the people who use that range at Eastern Illinois University.

Mr. Russo. But you haven't contracted with any private organizations, like the Wildlife Federation or the Illinois Rifle Association?

Mr. HARPER. No, sir.

Mr. Russo. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is the Honorable Woods Bowman, Illinois State Representative.

Mr. BOWMAN. Thank you, Congressman Russo.

Mr. Russo. Identify yourself for the record.

**STATEMENT OF HON. WOODS BOWMAN, ILLINOIS STATE REPRESENTATIVE, FOURTH REPRESENTATIVE DISTRICT**

Mr. BOWMAN. My name is Woods Bowman. I'm a member of the Illinois House of Representatives from the Fourth Representative District, which is the north shore area surrounding Chicago.

I want to commend the Congressman for his ingenuity in developing this legislation.

I have been a sponsor or cosponsor of numerous gun control bills in the Illinois House for a number of years. I've sat through hours of testimony, hearing both proponents and opponents argue about these bills, including, I might add, testimony from the Illinois Department of Conservation, which I will return to in a moment. But I believe that the legislation that is being presented today very, very well responds to arguments raised by both sides on that particular debate.

The people who argue in favor of handgun control will argue that the handgun is inherently an instrument of destruction and should be, if not eliminated, at least very tightly controlled and see it as the principal source of the carnage that takes place in urban America and see it as an instrument of victimization of our citizens.

Well, this legislation, I think, focuses on the victim and provides a link between handgun ownership and victimization so that it does provide that for every handgun sold, there is some assurance that people who are victims of crimes will be compensated for their pain and suffering. It also responds to the arguments raised by the other side, the people who do not wish to see gun control legislation passed. These are principally gun owners who see gun ownership as an inherent right. They often argue, I believe incorrectly, on the basis of constitutional principles, but nonetheless it is clear that from their personal point of view, they wish to have the right to own weapons.

This legislation does not infringe on anybody's right to own a weapon, as I see it, nor does it impose an additional tax which might be construed to restrain ownership by raising the price of the weapon.

What the legislation does is very carefully take an existing tax, work within the existing structure of gun ownership and use and simply allocate that money to crime victims. So as I see this, the entire



debate over the legislation being proposed, it is really a question of priorities, pure and simple, and whether we shall use the moneys raised from this excise tax for firearms training and wildlife habitat protection or whether we shall use it to assist victims of brutal crimes, life-threatening crimes.

Now, Mr. Congressman, I have a 92-percent Illinois Environmental Council rating. I have rated consistently in excess of 92 percent ever since I've been in the legislature. I consider myself an environmentalist and protector of wildlife and natural habitats. But let me tell you that, as I see it, when it comes to a question of priorities, we should place the highest priority on the protection of our citizens and making sure that those people who have been victimized are made whole. That should be our highest priority.

I must express disappointment that a Department of Conservation would not feel that conserving human life and safety is not at least as important as their own individual responsibilities for wildlife habitats.

I think that it is shocking, to me, that a Department of Conservation would take the attitude that conserving human life is not as important as the sorts of things that they are about.

So I'm happy to support this legislation, and I wish to commend the Congressman for his ingenuity in addressing a very serious problem.

Mr. Russo. Thank you very much, Mr. Bowman.

Let me just say that I think you have stated the issue clearly. It's not a matter of who is for or against gun control. Anyone who makes that argument is just basically against trying to help victims of crime with compensation. It's like talking about apples and oranges.

Basically what we're doing is taking the existing tax and trying to use it for a higher priority.

I think the wildlife people would have a stronger argument if the legislation was to transfer all the money from Pittman-Robertson or a substantial majority of the money for Pittman-Robertson.

But actually all we're doing is asking to take about \$33 million out of about \$120 million, so there is still the significant amount of \$92 million or better to be used for wildlife habitats and the other purposes of the Pittman-Robertson program.

So, again, it's a question of priorities.

My priorities are in line with yours. I would prefer protecting and helping human beings over and above protecting wildlife habitats—protection that is often strictly for hunters that want to be sure that it is easy for them to shoot deer. So I compliment you for your testimony and appreciate your support.

Mr. Bowman. Thank you.

Mr. Russo. Our next witness is Carolyn Budde, chairman of the Victims Family Committee.

#### **STATEMENT OF CAROLYN BUDDE, CHAIRMAN, VICTIMS FAMILY COMMITTEE, CHICAGO, ILL.**

Ms. BUDDE. My name is Carolyn Budde. I'm chairman of the Victims Family Committee. This committee is composed of families who have experienced in their lives the greatest tragedy of handgun misuse: the injury or death of a family member.

There are so many people whose lives have been tragically lost or who have been seriously injured and whose families have suffered emotionally and financially because of the handgun.

Handgun tragedies are a national problem. Tens of thousands of Americans are victimized by such violence each year.

The Victims Family Committee strongly supports Congressman Marty Russo in his effort to fund a nationwide victims of crime compensation program.

This program is to be funded in part by taxes collected on revolvers and pistols. This bill will amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the excise tax on handguns be transferred to a trust fund for the purpose of providing compensation to victims of crimes.

In 1980 the excise tax on handguns alone produced approximately \$23 million. The money is presently being used for such projects as building and maintaining target-shooting ranges.

Although I am not opposed to target-shooting ranges, it is only fitting that money spent on these weapons that create so many victims should be used to compensate them and their survivors. Let's use the money where it's really needed.

I feel this bill is critically important because it provides a measure of justice and financial help to those families most directly affected.

Although it will not bring back lives or heal injuries, it will provide some financial support to those handgun victims in need and to the families of handgun victims.

Congressman Russo's efforts reflect the high priority that we ought to place nationwide on such a program.

I might add, I'm glad to see that somebody cares. I think the victims and their families have been forgotten a little bit too long.

I speak with first-hand knowledge because I lost a 19-year-old son August 9, 1980. At that time you think, "Who really cares?" But let me tell you that I'm beginning to learn that there's a lot of people who care and have a lot of heart, and I thank you.

[An attachment to the prepared statement follows:]

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 17, 1983]

#### SOME VICTIMS OF CRIME TURNING THEIR GRIEF INTO HELP FOR OTHERS

(By Ray Gibson)

When Carolyn Budde appears before a congressional subcommittee hearing on crime victims here Monday, she is prepared to testify about 200 handgun murders, including that of her own son.

Budde, a 44-year-old North Sider, heads the Victims Family Committee, which offers moral support to the families of handgun victims. She will be a witness at a hearing to explore methods of aiding victims of crime.

Budde started her Victims Family Committee two years ago after her son, Steven, 19, was shot to death as a result of a quarrel after a traffic accident. So far, her group has offered support to the families of about 200 handgun victims.

"I thought I was the only person in the world who lost a son in this manner," Budde says, recalling her reaction to the murder of her son.

"I kept asking myself, 'Why, why?' You don't know who to talk to."

She says there are still days when she looks at her son's picture and starts to "cry like a baby."

But she says it helps her when she comforts the families of other victims. "When I help other families, it takes a little bit of my heartache away," she says. "Justice [alone] does not ease the pain."

Experts said Budde is part of an expanding national movement to help crime victims. Support groups for victims of crime and their grieving relatives are burgeoning, as are new state and federal programs to aid victims.

The hearing here by the House Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures is being held during the week President Reagan has designated National Victims of Crimes Week.

At the hearing Budde will support a bill introduced last week by U.S. Rep. Martin Russo [D., Ill.] a subcommittee member. It would make \$30 million collected through the federal tax on handgun sales available on a 50-50 matching basis to states that provide programs to compensate crime victims for funeral and hospital expenses not covered by insurance.

"If we speak loud enough, people are going to have to listen," Budde says. "We are the voices of the victims. My son can't speak for himself."

Her son's killer, Raul Rodrigues, 23, was convicted of the murder last May. Although she praises the assistant state's attorney who handled the prosecution, the court battle was hard on her.

"No one told me what to expect. I had to go to court once a month for a year and a half. . . . A family shouldn't have to go through that."

Budde says her group has about 90 members, including 15 who meet monthly to hear speakers or share common problems. After reports of handgun deaths, Budde calls or writes to the families of the victims telling them "they don't have to endure their tragedy alone."

Another crime victim support group, Parents of Murdered Children, has grown to 42 chapters in the United States since it was started in 1978. Margaret and Robert Coombs, of suburban Winfield, head the Chicago area chapter.

The Coombses formed the chapter in November, 1981, 10 months after their son, Christopher, 27, was beaten to death after a traffic accident and left at the side of the road. His killer has never been caught.

Like Budde's group, Parents of Murdered Children provides support for families.

The Coombses and Budde will appear Tuesday at a forum on "How the Innocent Deal with Crime," sponsored by State's Atty. Richard M. Daley. Daley also plans to propose a victims' bill of rights for Illinois.

The Russo bill and Daley's proposal are typical of efforts the last few years to focus attention on the victims of crime, who, according to a recent presidential task force, "have been overlooked by a system that often mistreats them."

"They have been the most neglected actors in the system," said John Stein, spokesman for the Washington-based National Organization for Victims Assistance.

Stein and others said growing attention to the problems of crime victims has resulted from increasing crime rates and federal efforts to aid violent-crime victims.

The most recent annual FBI national crime survey estimated that 30 percent of the nation's households were victimized by crime in 1981.

#### THE COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDY OF HANDGUN MISUSE

The Committee for the Study of Handgun Misuse (CSHM) is the educational affiliate of the Illinois Citizens For Handgun Control. CSHM responds to requests for publications and information on the handgun issue.

The administrator of CSHM, Mark Karlin, also works with the Victims Family Committee, the Medical Council on Handgun Violence, and the Education Committee. Speakers on the issue have received training from CSHM and have appeared in all types of forums.

Early this year CSHM was designated the national resource center for handgun control information by the United States Conference of Mayors when their Handgun Control Project was disbanded after seven years of operation.

The following articles will introduce you to some of CSHM's work:

#### VICTIMS FAMILY COMMITTEE MOVES AHEAD

At the heart of the issue of handgun violence is the injury and death inflicted upon over 100,000 Americans annually. To the surviving victims, the result of a momentary act of violence can mean a lifetime spent as a quadriplegic; to the families of victims who have died, the loss can leave a gaping emotional wound.



The Victims Family Committee (VFC) of the Committee for the Study of Handgun Misuse (CSHM) gathers monthly to discuss issues pertinent to the tragedies its members have shared, both as victims and as relatives of victims.

The VFC was founded by Caroline Budde, whose 19-year old son was murdered in the fall of 1980 during an altercation over a traffic incident. "When you lose someone because of a shooting, you tend to think you're the only person in the world who's suffered this way," Caroline says. "Talking to counselors and clergymen helps victims deal with their grief to some degree, but it's not enough," she maintains. "You're still left with the feeling of helplessness."

Chet Kulis, whose brother was shot in 1972, explains the unique situation committee members experienced before they banded together: "The grieving process that families of handgun violence go through is really unique. You don't go through the normal stages that mark a loved one's death from a long illness, or even a sudden death from sickness. And you can't bring in patriotism, as families of war victims can."

Discussing the details and emotion surrounding their own tragedies has helped the committee members to support each other. To further help them, a minister from the Michael Reese Hospital emergency room has spoken to the group about crisis support.

But mutual emotional support is balanced by a strong interest in the criminal justice system and in the enforcement of current handgun control laws. The group has met with First Assistant Attorney General of Illinois Paul Biebel, representatives of the State's Attorney's office, and other officials of the criminal justice system. The members of the committee are deeply concerned that the perpetrators of handgun violence be properly punished.

Their interest in enforcing current hand gun control laws will be highlighted by a study they will undertake. Working with the Cook County Court Watching Project, the VFC will begin to examine Gun Court in April. In February, Mayor Byrne initiated the consolidation of all misdemeanor gun cases around the city into one central Gun Court at 11th and State, greatly easing the task of observing the cases.

The VFC members want to see if violators of current handgun laws are punished. After a period of time spent studying court prosecutions and verdicts, they will announce their results to the public.

Out of Carolyn Budde's deepest sorrow grew a determination to aid others who have shared a similar grief, and to work toward preventing similar tragedies from occurring to others.

"This is one committee that I would like to stay small in number," observed Mark Karlin, CSHM administrator. "Unfortunately, with the appalling rise in handgun violence, the committee is certain to grow."

To assist the VFC and the Cook County Courtwatching Project in their observation of Gun Court, please call 641-5593. Monitors will be trained to watch court proceedings and record case dispositions.

Mr. Russo. Thank you, Mrs. Budde, for coming and testifying before us.

As I tried to point out with the last witness, the only funds that we are taking are the funds that are generated by the excise tax on handguns, and as you said in your statement, it's only fitting that the money spent on these weapons that create so many victims be used to compensate them.

We're not taking funds from rifles, ammunition or archery equipment. All those funds that are generated by the tax on that equipment is still in the fund to be used for wildlife habitation.

I just have a difficult time understanding how we can view handguns as closely related to wildlife and hunting. I think they are more closely related to victims of crime who are shot by these handguns and to the tremendous pain in our society that results.

As someone who works on the Victims Family Committee, how do you feel our victims of crime compensation program in the State of Illinois is working?

Ms. BUDDE. I think that there's a lot of people out there that have been victims of crimes. They don't really know that it exists. They

don't even know that it's there for them, that this help is there for them, because, with my experience, I didn't know anything about it until I was notified. I didn't know that it even existed.

I did not have any insurance on my son, and it helps; it really helps.

It makes you think that if people do care and they want to help in some way or another, I think it should be known that there is some type of help, financial help, to victims of crime. I think they will know that it will help them.

At first when this happened with my son and I was notified, I didn't want any money; I wanted the one that did this to my son.

But then you realize that you have to have help; you really do. You've got to have help from someone, and it really helped out a lot.

Mr. Russo. I think the attorney general and State's attorney have pretty much indicated the things that they're trying to do to help victims of crime and their families. But I understand that your committee is also out there to help deal with the emotional pain and other problems that victims suffer, and I want to commend you for your work, Mrs. Budde.

Ms. BUDDE. Thank you, and thank you for your work.

Mr. Russo. It's my pleasure.

The next witness is David Herbst, regional executive for the National Wildlife Federation.

Did I pronounce that right?

Mr. HERBST. Yes, sir.

Mr. Russo. Identify yourself for the record.

**STATEMENT OF DAVID HERBST, REGIONAL EXECUTIVE, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, ALSO REPRESENTING THE ILLINOIS WILDLIFE FEDERATION, INDIANA WILDLIFE FEDERATION, LEAGUE OF KENTUCKY SPORTSMEN, AND MICHIGAN UNITED CONSERVATION CLUBS, INC.**

Mr. HERBST. My name is David Herbst, Rochester, Indiana, regional executive for the National Wildlife Federation.

The Federation is the nation's largest private conservation organization, with over 4 million members and supporters throughout the United States, with affiliates in 49 States plus Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

I'm here today representing not only the Wildlife Federation, but also our affiliated organizations in my region: the Illinois Wildlife Federation, the Indiana Wildlife Federation, the League of Kentucky Sportsmen, and the Michigan United Conservation Clubs, Inc.

We are dedicated to the conservation, restoration, and management of this Nation's natural resources.

Many of our members are sportsmen with strong interests in outdoor recreation, including hunting and shooting sports. Many own and use handguns for hunting, target-shooting, and competitive shooting sports.

I welcome the opportunity to appear here today to tell you why our organizations oppose this legislation that would essentially transfer the excise tax on handguns away from the Federal aid in wildlife restoration program and use it to establish a fund to compensate the victims of crime.

However, let me hasten to add that the National Wildlife Federation does not object to the concept of victim compensation. The crime rate in the Nation is appalling.

We just disagree that a worthwhile program like Pittman-Robertson must be sacrificed in order to accomplish that objective.

The Federal aid in wildlife restoration program, otherwise known as the Pittman-Robertson (P-R) program, has long been a model of State and Federal cooperation that is crucial to funding the work of our State wildlife agencies.

Since its inception in 1937, the program has been supported by an excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition, with later amendments to include handguns and archery equipment.

Today the program generates approximately \$110 million per year, including the \$30 million-plus coming from the 10-percent excise tax on the sale of handguns.

These funds are then apportioned to the States and territories for wildlife restoration, hunter education and public target range development.

The National Wildlife Federation was involved in the development and passage of the original P-R program in 1937. We supported the addition of the 10-percent tax on handguns and have testified at other hearings in attempts to expand the tax to other items, such as component parts and ammunition.

Throughout our history, we've been heavily involved in the implementation of these programs through legislative, administrative, and educational efforts.

A recent example of this was the 1980 publication of the NWF Advanced Hunter Education and Shooting Sports Responsibility Manual.

The wildlife restoration and hunter safety programs that are supported by the P-R fund are extremely valuable to the American public.

Over the years, the value of the program has been evident in increased wildlife populations, improved habitat, additional target ranges and tens of thousands of individuals trained in safe gun handling through the hunter safety programs of the States.

It is unfortunate that an attempt is being made to cut into this valuable and already-limited fund. The proposal to cut the P-R fund by over one-fourth is apparently based on the December 1982 report of President Ronald Reagan's Task Force on Victims of Crime. Unfortunately, that report erroneously concludes that the excise tax on the sale of handguns should be diverted into a Crime Victims Assistance Fund. H.R. 2470 would do the same.

The task force report contains a number of errors. The report makes the statement that, quote, "There is little, if any, relation between handguns and hunting or wildlife activity," unquote.

In fact, however, handguns are authorized for use in 49 States for small-game hunting and 37 States for big-game hunting.

In addition, the Fish and Wildlife Service reports that in 1980, 1.3 million people spent 10.7 million days hunting with handguns.

The same report shows that handgun hunting is twice as popular as hunting with primitive black powder firearms. With the current



growth in handgun hunting, it will soon pass archery hunting in popularity.

The task force also concluded that diversion of these moneys into the crime victims assistance fund will reduce the Pittman-Robertson fund by about 25 percent of its total every year and that this would not unduly impede the purposes of the fund.

It is difficult to understand how a 25-percent reduction would do anything other than impede the P-R program, particularly in light of the massive Federal budget cuts that have put significant new burdens on State wildlife agencies.

Further evidence of the impact of such a cut is shown in the record of a House of Representatives hearing held on July 30, 1981, on the need to expand the P-R excise tax to other items since the fund is inadequate to handle present needs.

Simple logic says that diverting P-R funds would seriously harm ongoing State programs. I will use my own home State of Indiana as a case in point.

Since our Department of Natural Resources started using funds in about 1974, target ranges were developed on 11 of our public fish and wildlife areas, and we've trained close to 80,000 instructors and students—primarily youngsters—in safe handgun use.

Last year alone, we had approximately 105,000 people using our target ranges for the various shooting sports.

Now, I don't know about anyone else in this room, but if my income was suddenly reduced by approximately 25 percent or more, I would have considerable difficulty in meeting my family's own basic household budget each month.

In closing, I would say the objective of the President's task force is meritorious, but removal of these funds from the P-R program would seriously harm important, needed efforts in every State in this Nation.

Consequently, we would respectfully request that H.R. 2470 be withdrawn. Thank you for the opportunity to present our view.

Mr. Russo. Thank you, Mr. Herbst. Let me make a couple of comments.

I know how difficult it would be for you to subsist with a 25-percent cut in your income, but that's one of the comments we made to President Reagan when he wanted to cut funds for the elderly and the handicapped and the underprivileged and families with dependent children and for education in our country.

The President said it's a question of priorities. We just don't have enough money to do all the things we would like to do, but we have all the money in the world to build defense weapons.

So, there are a lot of families out there living on 25 percent less, and I guess my comment is that I think the Pittman-Robertson program would exist. It may not exist to the extent that everybody would like it, but, then, the victims of crime compensation program would not exist at all unless we had some funds.

Let me just ask you a couple of questions.

Why should we use Federal tax dollars to subsidize the hobby of any particular group or the membership of your organization?

Mr. HERBST. Why should we use Federal tax dollars?

Mr. Russo. Yes.

Mr. HERBST. This was a tax instituted in 1937 at the request of the sportsmen. It's a tax that has been supported by the sportsmen throughout the years, and it's not been a tax that's been forced upon them.

So I would say it's voluntarily paid by the individuals involved. It's coming from a special user group.

Mr. Russo. Again, any Federal tax that's put on the public ought to be allocated, as far as its use of the funds, in terms of the general good, public support and good public policy for the nation.

I guess when you say the tax was generated by the sportsman, it would be the same argument that could be used by taverns and saloon owners saying, you collect liquor tax, so you ought to build more saloons and more taverns for us.

Basically, with Federal taxes, we try to find what its best use is. All I'm saying in this particular piece of legislation is out of the \$120 million, let's allocate the part of it created by handgun taxes. As you know, that part of it was not put into effect until 1971.

The original purpose of Pittman-Robertson was to tax rifles, shotguns and ammunicitions, and the money was to be used for wildlife habitat and restoration.

Then we added target shooting and other uses, and the handgun tax was not part of the original Pittman-Robertson program.

All I'm trying to do is answer the argument of those who say we don't have the funds for a victims program by pointing out we can use the tax from a weapon that has a closer correlation with victims of crime than anything else, and that's the basic purpose of it.

So the argument that it's paid by the sportsman and it's his tax—well, I get taxed too, and there are a lot of things that the President and Congress spend my dollars for that I don't particularly care for, but it's done in terms of forming the best public policy for the nation, and all I'm trying to do is look at the use of this \$30 million in these terms.

In Illinois, when you say it's an impeded use of our funds, let me give you a couple of things that we do in Illinois.

We conduct studies on turkeys, deer population, restocking turkeys, fawn survival, deer reproduction and deer crop degradation. That's \$191,000.

Then we conduct deer range appraisals, movement and habitat use studies and conduct inventory of small-game animals.

Now, there are some people in this room here who disagree; they believe that impeding that is not too bad when you consider the good that you could do for crime victims, and there are several people in here who are victims of crime.

And I don't necessarily agree that it's really going to impede what we're trying to do in terms of wildlife habitat.

Mr. HERBST. Congressman, I guess that's what the debate is all about. There is disagreement on this.

Mr. Russo. The other part to look at is that most of the money which was set up to purchase land is used today to bring a bulldozer in and chop down the trees and make it easier for the hunters to get into the interior parts of the wildlife area to shoot deer and to hunt, rather than going in there for conservation without chopping down trees.

It seems to me the criticism of the program right now is that much of the restoration is in the form of roadbuilding, maintenance, pesticides, using poisons and it may make it easier for one species to live so the hunters can go out and shoot it, but it's killing a lot of other species, like birds and plants and non-game animals that are suffering as a result of this so-called wildlife habitat restoration.

Mr. HERBST. Congressman Russo, I would respond by saying it's true what you're saying: that we do manipulate the habitat. There is cutting of trees. There is creation of openings, waterholes and so on.

But I think we can also show conclusively that any work we do on the habitat benefits probably many more non-game species than the game species, such as the creation of wetlands.

Mr. Russo. As I understand it, there have been several suits that have been filed against the Pittman-Robertson program because opponents feel it is not doing its job in protecting the environment or the habitat; that actually it's creating greater problems for the non-game animals.

Mr. HERBST. I have to disagree, and I don't think there have been many successful suits.

Mr. Russo. Thank you very much, Mr. Herbst. I appreciate your testimony.

Our next witness is Sandy Horwitt from Friends of the Animals, Inc.

As you well understand, there are some legitimate concerns of those individuals who are interested in the future of Pittman-Robertson, as related here this morning, and we need to deal with that and address those concerns.

But at the same time, I'd like to thank you for the information you have provided in this particular area. It has been helpful.

**STATEMENT OF SANDY HORWITT, COMMITTEE FOR HUMANE LEGISLATION, FRIENDS OF ANIMALS, INC., ON BEHALF OF ALICE HERRINGTON, PRESIDENT**

Mr. HORWITT. Congressman, I'm really a pinch hitter this morning for Alice Herrington, who is president of Friends of Animals Committee for Humane Legislation.

She has a statement which, if it could be made part of the record, I would like to summarize this morning.

Mr. Russo. The entire statement will be made part of the record and you may proceed in summary.

[The statement of Ms. Herrington follows:]

**STATEMENT OF ALICE HERRINGTON, PRESIDENT OF FRIENDS OF ANIMALS' COMMITTEE ON HUMANE LEGISLATION**

Mr. Chairman, I am Alice Herrington, President of Friends of Animals' Committee on Humane Legislation, a national organization which has worked for animal protection for the past 25 years, and which represents more than 150,000 individual members throughout the United States.

I want to commend the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Rostenkowski, and the Chairman of the Subcommittee, Mr. Stark, for holding this important hearing. I also want to commend Congressman Marty Russo for his outstanding leadership in the introduction of H.R. 2470, which is the focus of today's hearing.



H.R. 2470 would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the transfer of the federal excise tax on handguns from the Pittman-Robertson program to a special trust fund for a victims of crime compensation program. As an animal protection organization, the Committee on Humane Legislation (CHL) takes no formal position on victims compensation or assistance issues although as an individual I would like to note my own support for Congressional action in these areas. In speaking on behalf of the CHL today, I would like to focus on the Pittman-Robertson program, which has had a major impact on wildlife since it was enacted in 1937.

The CHL strongly supports the Russo bill that would divert the federal excise tax on handguns from Pittman-Robertson (P-R). Some of the most respected environmental and animal protection groups in the country have long been highly critical of P-R practices, groups such as the Sierra Club, the Environmental Defense Fund, Defenders of Wildlife, Society for Animal Protective Legislation, The Fund for Animals, and the Humane Society of the United States. The CHL has shared in such criticism and, in fact, has played a leading role in trying to unmask P-R for what it is—an anti-environmental and anti-wildlife set of practices which have been cloaked in motherhood terms of “habitat restoration,” and “wildlife management,” by the special interests who benefit from the status quo.

P-R comes within the legislative jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee because the entire program is funded by federal excise taxes. In fact, since P-R was enacted in 1937, \$1.3 billion in tax revenues have been spent, which might make P-R the least known billion dollar program in the country. I know that the vast majority of the American people would be shocked and angered if they knew how these tax dollars were being spent. For example, millions of dollars are provided to the states each year under P-R to build and maintain target shooting ranges! If this does not qualify for the all-time Golden Fleece Award, then I do not know what does.

Mr. Chairman, P-R is a \$120 million a year boondoggle for the benefit and enrichment of such special interests as firearms manufacturers, the National Rifle Association and assorted other groups and companies that live off of the hunting industry. In fact, when Congress enacted P-R in 1937, it was quite clear that it was a hunting program, pure and simple. At least then, there was not the sanctimonious rhetoric about “wildlife” and “nature” from P-R proponents. At its inception, P-R was funded solely by excise taxes on rifles, shotguns and ammunition. The rationale was simple: these were hunting weapons and the excise taxes collected would be earmarked for programs at the state level to promote hunting. Federal funds, administered by the Interior Department, would cover 75 percent of the program cost, with the states providing the remainder.

But, in 1970, at the urging of the NRA and others, Congress approved a new 10 percent excise tax on handguns which was earmarked for the P-R program. Half of the handgun tax revenue, which now totals nearly \$35 million a year, is to be used by the states to build and maintain target shooting ranges, and for so-called “hunter training.” The other half of the handgun tax goes for other P-R programs which have also become controversial.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2470 would accomplish two laudable goals. First, it would shift federal excise tax revenues to a much higher national priority, namely, to help victims of crime. Second, H.R. 2470 would stop an outrageous special interest tax subsidy. Hunters and target shooters no more deserve a federal tax subsidy for their hobby than do bowlers, golfers or tennis players. The NRA claim that hunters and shooters have agreed to tax themselves and, therefore, have the “right” to use federal tax money for their hobby is, of course, ludicrous and hardly worthy of further comment. It might be pointed out, however, that it is no more logical to argue that all federal taxes on handguns be used to build target shooting ranges than it is to argue that all federal taxes on whiskey be used to build saloons and liquor stores.

It is also worth to note what H.R. 2470 will not do vis a vis P-R. Left untouched will be the bulk of P-R funding, which will continue to be derived from existing excise taxes on rifles, shotguns and ammunition, as well as from archery equipment. In FY 1981, these excise taxes totaled more than \$90 million. It should also be noted that in recent years, many states have actually returned P-R money to the Interior Department. In fact, in the most recent fiscal year, Illinois sent back to Washington more than \$260,000 of its P-R money. Recently, 15 percent of the states in any given year return a portion of their P-R funding to Washington.

It should also be noted that H.R. 2470 is not a handgun control measure. The bill would not increase the cost of such weapons nor would it have any impact on the availability of handguns. I mention this only because the opposition to H.R. 2470, the special interests who want to keep their gravy train on the track, will no doubt try to confuse the intent of H.R. 2470 by raising the emotional issue of handgun control. If such a bogus claim is made, it ought to be dismissed for what it is, an underhanded way to undermine support for an important piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the handgun excise tax ought to be removed from the P-R program. This tax has no historical connection to P-R; in fact, for more than 30 years, P-R was funded entirely by other taxes. There is also no programmatic tie between P-R and the handgun excise tax.

As I indicated earlier, Mr. Chairman, there has been much and growing criticism of P-R in recent years by animal protection and environmental groups. Although the original purpose of the P-R program was to promote hunting, attitudes and priorities have changed a great deal since the late 1930's. There is now a very strong sentiment for the protection of our precious environmental resources, and for the protection of wildlife for wildlife's sake—and not simply for the sake of providing more animals for hunting.

Yet, P-R has rolled merrily along, safe from the annual authorization and appropriation process, and safe from regular public debate and scrutiny. How many legislators would vote annual appropriations to build and maintain target ranges? How many legislators would vote to spend tax dollars to burn intentionally thousands of acres of forests merely to increase the supply of a few game animals? The Sierra Club, among others, has warned about the dangers to ecosystems of burning or clear-cutting of forests. The Committee for Humane Legislation, and other animal protection groups, has warned repeatedly of the tremendous loss of non-game wildlife through the practices of habitat manipulation carried on by the P-R program. All of us have tried to put the spotlight of public opinion on the unnecessary and destructive use of herbicides and pesticides in all too many P-R projects. So much of P-R is not only a waste of tax dollars but an outright subversion of an enlightened environmental and wildlife ethic of the 1980's.

In short, P-R is a relic that is now out of sync with national priorities. In past years, perhaps the only significant redeeming part of P-R was the availability of funds to help states purchase habitat. Those days are largely over however. The clear facts are that most states now spend virtually no P-R money to acquire land. In one recent year, 30 states did not spend a dime of their P-R funds on land acquisition and most of the rest only a tiny fraction of the available funds. Thus, we are left with the bulk of P-R as a special interest program, directly at odds with the larger public interest in sound environmental and wildlife practices.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2470 has the full support of the Friends of Animals' Committee for Humane Legislation. Congressional approval would reduce the waste of public funds and the harm to wildlife which are major consequences of P-R programs. President Reagan's Task Force on Victims of Crime urged Congress to re-evaluate its priorities regarding the use of the handgun excise tax. I wholeheartedly support that conclusion.

Mr. HORWITT. The Committee for Humane Legislation is a national organization which has worked for animal protection for the past 25 years and which represents more than 150,000 individual members throughout the United States. While the committee itself does not take a formal position on victim compensation issues or victim assistance issues, as an individual, Mrs. Herrington is highly supportive of those efforts in Congress, including your bill, Congressman Russo, H.R. 2470, to bring a measure of justice to people who are victims of crime in the United States.

H.R. 2470 would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the transfer of the Federal excise tax on handguns from the Pittman-Robertson program to a special trust fund for a victims of crime compensation program.

The Committee for Humane Legislation strongly supports H.R. 2470, the bill that you've introduced, Congressman Russo, that would divert these excise taxes from Pittman-Robertson.

Some of the most respected environmental and animal protection groups in the country have long been highly critical of Pittman-Robertson practices, groups such as the Sierra Club, the Environmental Defense Fund, Defenders of Wildlife, Society for Animal Protective Legislation, the Fund for Animals, and the Humane Society of the United States.

The Committee for Humane Legislation has shared in such criticism and, in fact, has played a leading role in trying to unmask Pittman-Robertson for what it is: an antienvironmental and antiwildlife set of practices which have been cloaked in the motherhood terms of, quote, habitat restoration, unquote, and, quote, wildlife management, unquote, by the special interests who benefit from the status quo.

Since Pittman-Robertson was enacted in 1937, \$1.3 billion in tax revenues have been spent, which might make Pittman-Robertson the least-known billion-dollar program in the country. I know that the vast majority of the American people would be shocked and angered if they knew how these tax dollars were being spent. For example, millions of dollars are provided to the States each year under Pittman-Robertson to build and maintain target-shooting ranges. If this does not qualify for the all-time Golden Fleece award, then I do not know what does.

When Congress enacted Pittman-Robertson in 1937, it was quite clear that it was a hunting program, pure and simple. At least then there was not the sanctimonious rhetoric about wildlife and nature from Pittman-Robertson proponents.

As you've pointed out, Congressman, at its inception, Pittman-Robertson was funded entirely by the excise taxes on so-called long guns, shotguns, and rifles and ammunition, an 11-percent excise tax. The rationale was that these were hunting weapons and that there was some tie between taxing those weapons and a program that would be, out and out, pure and simple, a hunting program.

So over the years until 1970, the sole funding for the program came from that 11-percent excise tax, and in 1970, things changed and a 10-percent excise tax on handguns was added into the pool.

Now, the reason that groups such as the Committee for Humane Legislation, the Sierra Club, the Environmental Defense Fund, and the others that I've mentioned have been so critical of Pittman-Robertson is because throughout all of these years, it has had the tunnel vision of being a pro-hunting program to the detriment, as you pointed out to the last witness, of not only nongame species, the ones that hunters don't hunt, but also to the environment itself: to get at deer or to change the feeding habits or patterns or places where deer feed.

There has been burning of forests, clear cutting of whole stands of forests to change the migratory flight patterns of waterfowl, the kind of fowl that hunters like to shoot. There have been intentional floodings of lowlands. Now, when all of those things happen, the entire ecosystem is changed, and whenever you at that level start to fool with Mother Nature, there is really a price to pay.



From the point of view of the environmental groups and the animal and wildlife protection groups, that is an extremely high price to pay and a price that really should not be paid, at least when you view this program not from a narrow special interest, but from the wider public interest.

When this program, Congressman Russo, was started in 1937, those were the days before we all became much more sensitive to the environment, before we had a different value and attitude toward wildlife. In that respect, a good part of Pittman-Robertson is really a relic. It is a relic of the past. But because it has been on this gravy train, funded entirely by excise taxes and never has to really go through an annual appropriations process, that train has continued on track since 1937.

One of the real benefits of your bill, in addition to assisting victims, is that it has, for the first time in a long time, put a public spotlight on this whole environmental and wildlife area which really needs to be looked at very carefully.

So in our view, you are not only a friend in terms of bringing justice to victims of crime, but you are a friend of the environment and wildlife as well.

So the Committee for Humane Legislation strongly supports the passage of H.R. 2470 and would like to do anything that we can to educate the public as to what the real issues are.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Russo. I thank you, sir.

The next witness is the Honorable Adele Neems, alderman of the third ward of the city of Evanston.

Ms. NEEMS. Thank you, Congressman Russo.

Mr. Russo. Would you identify yourself for the record, Adele?

**STATEMENT OF HON. ADELE S. NEEMS, ALDERMAN OF THE THIRD WARD OF THE CITY OF EVANSTON, ILL.**

Ms. NEEMS. My name is Adele Neems, and I've been an alderwoman on the Evanston City Council for 10 years and a member of the Police Services Committee since its creation in 1975.

I am here to testify in favor of H.R. 2470 to create a crime victims compensation trust fund. Personally, this is a statement supported by the city of Evanston.

I would personally like to support all the comments made by the previous speaker. My statement has a somewhat different perspective.

Evanston is a mature community with a diverse population of 74,000 residents that has an impressive record of action relating to crime and crime victims. We are one of only a handful of cities throughout the Nation to ban the sale and possession of handguns within our borders, and we've had for many years a strong and effective victim witness advocacy program to promote immediate response and followup to victims of crime.

Despite our local efforts, however, to aid crime victims, we are seriously handicapped by decreasing municipal funds and the lack of a coordinated network of services and programs for crime victims.

I'm sure you're aware, as we all are, that the most recent annual FBI national crime survey estimated that 30 percent of the Nation's households were victimized by crimes in 1981. It is, therefore, important that each level of government has a direct obligation to ameliorate the problems of crime victims.

We have some local programs. You've heard of some of the programs of the State of Illinois. We think it's critical that the Federal Government now create some programs that shows its concern for the victims of crime.

Because many victims of crime suffer physical, psychological, and financial trauma, they require a great variety of services and funds. Many victims need, among other things, compensation for loss of property or damage to property, help with medical bills, money for child care so that they can appear in court, money for transportation so that they can get to court, money to help if a social security check is stolen, counseling—group counseling, individual counseling—for all kinds of victims of crime. But, above all, they need a knowledgeable and sympathetic advocate to help guide them through the criminal justice system.

It is with a certain concern that we recognize that the funds that are currently obligated from the taxes on firearms could be viewed as promoting the use of firearms rather than reducing their use.

Adoption of H.R. 2470 represents, to us, an initial effort on the part of the Federal Government to show at least as much sensitivity toward the needs of the victims of firearms as it does to the desires of the hunters.

I, therefore, urge your support of H.R. 2470. Thank you.

[The prepared statement follows:]

**STATEMENT OF ALDERMAN ADELE S. NEEMS, THIRD WARD, EVANSTON, ILL.**

My name is Adele Neems. I have been an Alderman on the Evanston City Council for 10 years and a member of the Council's Police Service Committee for eight years. I am here to testify in favor of HR 2470 to create a "Crime Victims Compensation Trust Fund."

Evanston has an impressive record of action relating to crime and crime victims. We are one of only a handful of cities throughout the nation to ban the sale and possession of handguns within our borders, and we have had for many years, a strong and effective victim-witness advocacy program to provide immediate response and follow-up to victims of crime. Despite our determined local efforts to aid crime victims, we are handicapped by the lack of a coordinated network of services and programs for crime victims.

Creation of a Crime Victims Compensation Trust Fund would demonstrate the government's concern for the victims of crime and enable victims to have the resources necessary to pursue their cases through the criminal justice system.

Victims of crime suffer physical, psychological, emotional and financial trauma in addition to loss of property and income. Even though the State of Illinois has a program of monetary compensation for crime victims operated through the Attorney-General's office, the program guidelines are so restrictive that the average person is not helped at all, and in fact, the monies are not being spent.

A Crime Victims Compensation Trust Fund could provide monetary compensation to victims without requiring them first to exhaust their medical and property insurance resources.

Crime victims deserve monetary compensation for loss of property, off-the-job time, medical and property damage bills, but they also require a variety of services that a Crime Victims Compensation Trust Fund could provide. Victims need immediate assistance at the time of crime beyond that provided by law enforce-

ment officers. They need counseling, referral services, follow-up, and somebody to advocate on their behalf in court. A Crime Victims Compensation Trust Fund could provide training for people on the impact of victimization; it could provide funding for the establishment and coordination of victim-advocacy programs so that victims are assured professional counseling and services with no further loss of income and no further disruption to their lives. Local crime victim service units should be able to assist and guarantee victims the money they need to pay babysitters so they can appear in court, transportation money to get to court, temporary financial help in the case of stolen social security checks, professional group therapy for victims of rape and domestic violence, and follow-up counseling and support.

Creation of a Crime Victims Compensation Trust Fund would be a significant step toward achieving effective, coordinated, services, programs and compensation to victims of crime.

I urge your support of H.R. 2470.

Mr. Russo. Thank you very much, Adele.

How is the victims of crime compensation program of the State working in Evanston?

Is there much publicity in Evanston?

Ms. NEEMS. No. We don't have much publicity, and we really don't get many funds for that. We fund our program from our general revenue.

We have tremendous pressure every year to keep that budget in place, so that this year we have to cut part of the program. We can't give the kinds of raises to maintain the professional staff that's necessary.

When someone helps, you need a quality of help that's really important because if you diminish that quality, put people in who don't have the professional background, you really don't serve the victim.

In addition, if what we're involved with now is crime and ways of dealing with crime on so many levels, this is one aspect of it.

In Evanston, as in other communities, we help the victim for the victim's self. We also help the victim through that criminal justice system so that we can see what's happening in the courts, make them comfortable with testifying.

They're willing to drop a case because there is a fear, there is a lack of knowledge, so that on all these levels, direct financial aid is really critical.

Mr. Russo. I agree with you.

Thank you very much for testifying.

Our next witness is Chester Kulis, probation officer of Illinois.

Mr. KULIS. Good morning, Congressman.

Mr. Russo. Good morning.

#### **STATEMENT OF CHESTER J. KULIS, U.S. PROBATION OFFICER, CHICAGO, ILL.**

Mr. KULIS. My name is Chester Kulis. For the past 13 years, I have worked in the criminal justice system, first as a sociologist with the Illinois Department of Corrections and now as a U.S. probation officer. I am also an attorney and serve on the faculty of the criminal justice program at Loyola University and the sociology department at Rosary College.

My experience with handgun violence is not only professional but highly personal. On May 12, 1972, my 20-year-old brother, Michael,



was murdered following his being robbed while riding a Chicago Transit Authority subway train.

A generation ago, my uncle and a policeman confronted a man who had robbed my uncle some time before, and the offender pulled out a handgun and fatally shot the officer. Ironically, this incident also took place on a CTA train platform.

I strongly support Congressman Russo's bill. In the so-called gun control debates, the demagogues would have us believe that there are only two clearly defined constituencies regarding this issue: criminals versus law-abiding citizens armed to the teeth to protect themselves.

There is a third group who represent the bulk of Americans: law-abiding citizens who don't own a handgun and who are literally caught in the crossfire of this debate. For the most part, we do not object to hunting, but we do wonder how shooting at a human silhouette with a handgun can be considered sportsmanship, especially given the handgun slaughter in this country.

We handgun victims are the true casualties of this debate. The criminal justice system, the politicians and the media have treated us with either indifference or benign neglect.

This bill is a beginning to rectify the situation. It follows the spirit of the Witness Protection and Victim Compensation Act of 1983, wherein the Federal Government recognized the forgotten plight of crime victims.

Those of you who have not been victimized in a crime of violence cannot begin to imagine the severity of the trauma or its permanence. Through the socialization process, we all learn to work through the grieving process following the death of family and friends through natural causes.

However, no one is prepared to emotionally accept harm inflicted on one's family or friends through handgun violence. In addition to whatever physical trauma occurs, victims, as well as their families and friends, experience severe emotional depression, anxiety, fear, and rage.

In my brother's case, my family was further burdened by a hospital bill of several thousand dollars. Having to pay this bill under these circumstances rubbed salt into our emotional wounds.

Handgun violence strikes at random, and it is fitting that a tax on handguns be directed against the harm we victims have endured. This legislation recognizes that the widespread availability of handguns has made the American citizen an endangered species.

It is ironic that Congress is considering this bill, however commendable it is, since we all recognize that it only addresses the consequences of handgun proliferation: victims who have been intimidated, crippled, and killed.

But for the emotional trauma which often causes them to retreat into themselves, crime victims would be here en masse to demand that Congress address the cause of so much violence and suffering.

This bill is not merely a humanitarian gesture; it is demanded by our sense of social justice. However, its passage will not placate the victims of handgun violence who recognize that meaningful progress can only be made by tough handgun control at the Federal level as proposed by the Illinois Citizens for Handgun Control, Handgun Control, Inc., and the National Coalition to Ban Handguns.

Congressman, the only specific recommendation which I would make concerning this legislation is that the handgun packaging and bills of sale must conspicuously note that the imposition of the excise tax is for the benefit of handgun victims. Its somber message might serve to educate.

Thank you for your interest in the forgotten victims of the handgun debate.

Mr. Russo. Thank you very much, sir.

There are a lot of things with which I agree in your statement, and I think that there have been a lot of people on the national level that have tried to do things for victims of crime.

But we've been impeded by the fact that there are Members of Congress who feel that we would be creating another entitlement program which would be a runaway program and that spending would not be held in check.

What we try to do in this particular legislation is set a ceiling on how much we raise every year, and that would be it.

We're trying to deal with this problem, so any help that your organization or you yourself can give to further a grassroots effort for victims of crime compensation legislation would be appreciated.

Mr. Kulis. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. Russo. Thank you.

Our next witness is Evelyn Craig from the Crisis Center for South Suburbia.

**STATEMENT OF EVELYN CRAIG, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CRISIS CENTER FOR SOUTH SUBURBIA, WORTH, ILL., ALSO REPRESENTING THE ILLINOIS COALITION AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

Ms. CRAIG. Thank you for the opportunity to address this committee on such a critical topic as the compensation of victims of crime.

I represent the Crisis Center for South Suburbia, a shelter and comprehensive service agency for the victims of domestic violence in the south and southwestern suburbs of Chicago.

During the last fiscal year alone, we provided services to 2,203 victims of domestic violence.

I also represent the Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence, a statewide network of 43 community-based programs, providing shelter, counseling, advocacy, and crisis intervention to battered women, their children, and, whenever possible, to their abusers.

Over 12,000 women and children sought refuge and assistance from coalition programs last year, a figure said to represent no more than 35 percent of the potential users of these services.

Before continuing, however, I want to note the appropriateness of holding this hearing on the second day of National Victim Rights Week and to second your remarks in the Congressional Record of April 12, where you state:

National Victim Rights Week deserves more than rhetoric bemoaning the plight of the forgotten participants in our criminal justice system. What must come now is action. Crime victims deserve our empathy, respect, and tangible assistance.

I also want to commend you, Congressman Russo, and your colleagues in the House for their leadership in confronting the need for

victim compensation through sponsorship of legislation which would provide that the excise tax on handguns be transferred to a trust fund to be used for the purpose of providing compensation to the victims of crime.

For too long, our Government in all three of its branches has ignored the suffering and abuse of the victims of violent crimes in the criminal justice system.

This testimony will focus on domestic violence, primarily spouse abuse, as it relates to the compensation of victims of crime.

Let me emphasize that domestic violence is, above all, a crime; that it is a crime which affects millions of American families and that it is a crime which has far-reaching effects on all of us.

Our criminal justice system has failed to respond adequately to this crime and has, indeed, gone one step further by victimizing the victims through insensitivity, prejudice and desultory enforcement of the criminal code in family disturbances involving spouses.

Domestic violence is criminal, of epidemic proportions and has devastating consequences. It is assault, battery, and homicide. It breaks bones, causes miscarriage, internal injuries and death.

Domestic violence results in 25 percent of all homicides, including 40 percent of all female homicides; 40 percent of all police injuries; 80 percent of violent juveniles and adult offenders. Domestic violence is considered to be the most common underreported crime in America today.

Criminal laws, however, are only theoretically available to abused women. Violence in families continues partly because it is ignored or tacitly accepted by the institutions from which battered women seek help.

The battered spouse faces indifference, neglect, disbelief, and often hostility at the hands of law enforcement agencies across the board.

Recently a Cook County Circuit Court judge dismissed the case of a severely battered woman because she cried while giving testimony against her husband of more than 20 years. This judge further threatened to find the victim in contempt of court unless she ceased her "blubbing in his courtroom."

Programs across the country, most notably in Santa Monica County, King County, and in Philadelphia, have succeeded, with the assistance of Federal funding through the LEAA, not only to increase the number of domestic violence cases which were prosecuted, but to bring about an impressive conviction rate of 83 percent.

Thus, some programs which have been sponsored through Federal programs to assist the victims of domestic violence in their efforts to work through the criminal justice system have, in fact, made the criminal justice system not only a more responsive system but a more efficient one.

I would like to talk very briefly about some particular instances that I've come across with clients I've worked with involving the use of handguns.

I'd like to tell you about Carol, who was chased out of her home in the middle of the night with her three young children by her husband who was pointing a gun at her.

She had called the local police four times in the past, but since the gun was registered in his name, they refused to do anything about it.



I'd like to tell you about Mary, a young mother who, after months of severe abuse, finally left her home after she found her daughter placing bullets from her husband's handgun into her mouth.

I'd like to tell you about Barbara, a high school teacher, who was kept out of her home night after night in the middle of winter at gunpoint by her husband.

Again, she called the police, and, again, she was told that since the handgun was registered, there was no justice for her.

Now, what does all of this have to do with federally funded victims compensation programs?

I think, as I pointed out before, Federal funds can help set up model programs. Additionally, they can provide more efficiently for money to go directly to the victims for services, as have been mentioned in previous testimony.

These people need help with child care services, they need help for counseling, they need help for employment training.

If not, what we're telling them is that there's two systems of justice in this country—one for criminals and another one for the victim—and that the system for the latter is a much harsher one.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF EVELYN CRAIG, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE CRISIS CENTER FOR SOUTH SUBURBIA, WORTH, ILL., AND MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ILLINOIS COALITION AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Thank you for the opportunity to address this committee on such a critical topic, the compensation of victims of crime. I represent the Crisis Center for South Suburbia, a shelter and comprehensive service agency for the victims of domestic violence in the southwestern suburbs of Chicago. During the last fiscal year alone, we provided services to 2203 women, children and men. I also represent the Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence, a statewide network of forty three community programs, providing shelter, advocacy and crisis intervention for battered women, their children, and whenever possible, to their abusers. Over five thousand women and children sought refuge and assistance from our programs last year, a figure said to represent no more than thirty percent of the potential users of these services.

Before continuing, I want to note the appropriateness of holding this hearing on the second day of National Victim Rights Week and to second the remarks of Rep. Marty Russo in the Congressional Record of April 12, 1983 when he states: "National Victim Rights Week deserves more than rhetoric bemoaning the plight of the forgotten participants in our criminal justice system. . . . Words come easy, and victims have heard plenty of those. What must come now is action. Crime victims deserve our empathy, respect, and tangible assistance." I also want to commend Rep. Russo and his colleagues in the House, Reps. Downey, Blaggi and Scheuer for their leadership in confronting the need for victim compensation through sponsorship of legislation which would provide that the excise tax on handguns be transferred to a trust fund to be used for the purpose of providing compensation to the victims of crime. For too long, our government in all three of its branches has ignored the suffering and abuse of the victims of violent crime in the criminal justice system.

This testimony will focus on domestic violence—primarily, spouse abuse—as it relates to the compensation of victims of crime. Let me emphasize that domestic violence is, above all, a crime, that it is a crime which affects millions of American families and that it is a crime which has far-reaching effects on all of us. Our criminal justice system has failed to respond adequately to this crime and has, indeed, gone one step further by victimizing the victims through insensitivity, prejudice and desultory enforcement of the criminal code in family disturbances involving spouses.

Domestic violence is criminal, of epidemic proportions, and has devastating consequences. It is assault, battery and homicide. It breaks bones; causes miscarriages, internal injuries and death. Domestic violence results in:

25 percent of all homicides, including 10 percent of all female homicides,

40 percent of all police injuries,

80 percent of violent juveniles and adult offenders.

Domestic violence is considered to be the most common underreported crime in America today. Authorities estimate that:

Only one in ten episodes of abuse is reported to police,

15 to 28 million women are repeatedly abused each year, and many of these suffer serious physical harm,

One half of all marriages involve at least one episode of violence between spouses, and abuse is a factor in one-half of all divorces,

Close to a million elderly people are battered annually by their grown children or other caretakers.

Domestic battering involves serious injury. A Task Force in Connecticut found that physical harm from 73.9 percent of the spouse abuse cases reported would be classified as a felony, if committed by a stranger. Violence in the family, in all its forms: homicide, abuse, incest, neglect; and with all its victims: battered wives, abused children, the elderly; is a devastating phenomenon and is of epidemic proportions in our society. The crime of domestic violence must be stopped and prevented.

Criminal laws, however, are only theoretically available to abused women. Violence in families continues partly because it is ignored or tacitly accepted by the institutions from which battered women seek help. The battered spouse faces indifference, neglect, disbelief and often hostility at the hands of law enforcement agencies across the board. Recently, a Cook County Circuit Court judge dismissed the case of a severely battered woman because she cried while giving testimony against her husband of more than twenty years. This judge further threatened to find the victim in contempt of court unless she ceased her "blubbering in his courtroom." At this, a criminal case, which had involved numerous police calls and the support and energy of the States Attorney involved was dismissed due to the whim of one judge. The treatment of domestic violence in our courts illustrates the often-voiced concern that we have two systems of justice in this country: one for criminals and one for victims and that the latter are tried and sentenced with greater harshness.

Mr. Russo. Thank you very much, Evelyn. We certainly appreciate your testimony.

Keep up the good work out at South Suburbia.

Ms. CRAIG. Thank you.

Mr. Russo. This concludes our hearing.

I want to thank all those who participated in the hearing process. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12 noon, the hearing was adjourned.]

[Submissions for the record follow:]

HAZEL CREST, ILL., April 21, 1983.

HON. FORTNEY H. STARK,

*Chairman, Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN STARK: Please accept this letter as written testimony in support of Congressman Martin Russo's legislation which I understand would transfer the existing 10 percent excise tax on handguns into a trust fund for victims of crime. Since handguns are used in the commission of many crimes, it certainly seems appropriate that a substantial portion of the taxes collected in the sale of such weapons should be used to compensate those victimized by handguns.

Therefore, I would like to be registered in support of Congressman Russo's legislation and I am very grateful you and your subcommittee have given us this opportunity to address this issue in our area.

Sincerely,

RICHARD F. KELLY, Jr.,  
State Senator.

TESTIMONY OF J. WARREN CASSIDY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION, INSTITUTE FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The National Rifle Association would like to thank you for the opportunity to place in the Record our views regarding Congressman Russo's proposal to establish a victims of crime compensation program funded by the existing 10% excise tax on handguns (H.R. 2470). Of course, if your Committee holds additional hearings on this proposal in Washington, we will request the opportunity to make a more detailed presentation.

The National Rifle Association opposes the Russo proposal in the strongest possible terms. H.R. 2470 is nothing more than a direct slap in the face to the millions of law-abiding sportsmen and firearms owners who pay this excise tax. It imposes a collective guilt upon those of us who own firearms legitimately for the acts of the criminal element of our society. This proposal would cripple a wildlife conservation program which has been the financial backbone for state fish and wildlife agency activities since 1939—The Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Conservation Fund.

The Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Conservation Fund is financed by the excise taxes collected on the sale of firearms, ammunition and archery equipment. Funding of Pittman-Robertson for FY 1983 totals slightly more than \$107 million. These funds are distributed to the states based upon a formula that takes into account the number of hunting licenses sold and the land area of each state. The states then utilize the money to acquire, develop and manage wildlife habitat for wildlife management research and for hunter safety programs based upon a 75/25 percent matching concept.

Attached is a chart prepared by the Department of the Interior showing the FY 1983 distribution of Pittman-Robertson Funds to the respective states and territories. Mr. Russo's proposal would strip the handgun portion of this funding base away from Pittman-Robertson resulting in a decrease of over \$30 million in available funding. The negative impact which such a loss would have upon state wildlife conservation efforts is incalculable.

This proposed "raid" upon our nation's wildlife conservation effort is premised upon several major misconceptions. The first is that there is little if any relationship between handguns and hunting or wildlife activity. This is patently false. There are more than 30 states which have specifically provided for big game handgun hunting seasons. Small game handgun hunting is permitted in all but one state (New Jersey). In 1980 over 1.3 million hunters utilized handguns to pursue game animals. Attached is a list of the types of handgun hunting allowed on a state by state basis.

The second major misconception is that handgun ownership is an important cause of criminal violence. It assumes that those purchasing handguns are collectively responsible for their criminal misuse. Again this conception is patently false. The LEAA financed study by Professors Wright and Rossi of the University of Massachusetts concluded "... there is little evidence to show that gun ownership among the population as a whole is, per se, an important cause of criminal violence." They stated: "Truly decisive evidence—for example, evidence on the ensuing criminality of persons who acquire firearms—does not exist."

According to a U.S. Department of Justice Survey, one half of the handguns purchased in this country are for sporting and recreational purposes. One quarter are purchased by law enforcement. One quarter are purchased by those who fear criminal victimization. The net effect of Congressman Russo's proposal is to tax sportsmen, law enforcement officers and those who fear becoming victims of crime for the activities of our society's criminal element.

How do violent criminals acquire firearms? They don't purchase them through legitimate channels. Statistics indicate that the source of criminal firearms is theft or other illicit criminal activity. Approximately one year ago the Washington Post ran a story about an illicit dealer operating out of a suitcase in North West Washington, D.C. The story related this persons acquisition of firearms through illegal channels and his subsequent illegal sales. It is ridiculous to assume that such an individual will collect and report to Federal officials any excise tax on the illegal handguns sales he makes for criminal purposes. Individuals such as this should be the target of our criminal law activities, not the law-abiding citizen.



Finally proponents of this legislation incorrectly presume that the Pittman-Robertson funds are only for the benefit of hunters and not the public as a whole. Again this is incorrect. While more than 17 million law-abiding citizens of this country hunt, the Department's of Interior and Commerce estimate that more than 87 million other Americans engage in additional wildlife related activities including fishing and non-consumptive activities. Over 40 percent of this activity is conducted on state owned land, in a large part acquired and managed through the use of Pittman-Robertson Funds. A major reduction in these funds will cripple the various states' ability to manage these facilities for benefit of all citizens who participate in wildlife related recreation.

The NRA and its 2.5 million members will totally oppose any proposal which will penalize the law-abiding sportsman and firearms owner in this Country. Congressman Russo's proposal, in the form of H.R. 2470, to strip approximately one third of the funding base of Pittman-Robertson wildlife restoration fund is just such an illconceived proposal. It does not even attempt to reach the roots of the violent crime problem our nation faces but instead taxes the law-abiding for the acts of the criminal, all at the expense of a program which is the financial backbone of our nation's wildlife conservation effort. The legislation introduced by Mr. Russo is based upon false conceptions and must be defeated.

"Pittman-Robertson"  
Final Apportionment for Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration  
Fiscal Year 1983

|                 | <u>Wildlife<br/>Restoration</u> | <u>Hunter<br/>Safety</u> | <u>Total</u>  |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| Alabama         | \$ 1,488,153                    | \$ 455,699               | \$ 1,943,852  |
| Alaska          | 4,412,000                       | 188,200                  | 4,600,200     |
| Arizona         | 2,077,342                       | 318,383                  | 2,395,725     |
| Arkansas        | 1,599,830                       | 267,735                  | 1,867,565     |
| California      | 3,582,847                       | 564,600                  | 4,147,447     |
| Colorado        | 2,289,882                       | 338,411                  | 2,628,293     |
| Connecticut     | 441,200                         | 364,035                  | 805,235       |
| Delaware        | 441,200                         | 188,200                  | 629,400       |
| Florida         | 1,461,392                       | 564,600                  | 2,025,992     |
| Georgia         | 1,795,558                       | 564,600                  | 2,360,158     |
| Hawaii          | 441,200                         | 188,200                  | 629,400       |
| Idaho           | 1,811,959                       | 188,200                  | 2,000,159     |
| Illinois        | 1,615,059                       | 564,600                  | 2,179,659     |
| Indiana         | 1,344,284                       | 564,600                  | 1,908,884     |
| Iowa            | 1,540,424                       | 341,287                  | 1,881,711     |
| Kansas          | 1,739,964                       | 276,836                  | 2,016,800     |
| Kentucky        | 1,335,355                       | 428,916                  | 1,764,271     |
| Louisiana       | 1,662,630                       | 492,471                  | 2,155,101     |
| Maine           | 1,024,157                       | 188,200                  | 1,212,357     |
| Maryland        | 567,844                         | 493,933                  | 1,061,777     |
| Massachusetts   | 441,200                         | 564,600                  | 1,005,800     |
| Michigan        | 3,629,299                       | 564,600                  | 4,193,899     |
| Minnesota       | 2,474,028                       | 477,615                  | 2,951,643     |
| Mississippi     | 1,394,291                       | 295,278                  | 1,689,569     |
| Missouri        | 2,147,087                       | 564,600                  | 2,711,687     |
| Montana         | 2,589,113                       | 198,200                  | 2,777,313     |
| Nebraska        | 1,530,786                       | 188,200                  | 1,718,986     |
| Nevada          | 1,671,080                       | 188,200                  | 1,859,280     |
| New Hampshire   | 441,200                         | 188,200                  | 629,400       |
| New Jersey      | 468,310                         | 564,600                  | 1,032,910     |
| New Mexico      | 2,060,153                       | 188,200                  | 2,248,353     |
| New York        | 2,600,069                       | 564,600                  | 3,164,669     |
| North Carolina  | 1,588,375                       | 564,600                  | 2,152,975     |
| North Dakota    | 1,226,441                       | 188,200                  | 1,414,641     |
| Ohio            | 1,762,655                       | 564,600                  | 2,327,255     |
| Oklahoma        | 1,757,915                       | 354,393                  | 2,112,308     |
| Oregon          | 2,379,639                       | 308,402                  | 2,688,041     |
| Pennsylvania    | 3,862,670                       | 564,600                  | 4,427,270     |
| Rhode Island    | 441,200                         | 188,200                  | 629,400       |
| South Carolina  | 975,928                         | 365,398                  | 1,341,326     |
| South Dakota    | 1,472,442                       | 188,200                  | 1,660,642     |
| Tennessee       | 2,017,620                       | 537,780                  | 2,555,400     |
| Texas           | 4,412,000                       | 564,600                  | 4,976,600     |
| Utah            | 1,775,433                       | 188,200                  | 1,963,633     |
| Vermont         | 454,711                         | 188,200                  | 642,911       |
| Virginia        | 1,673,046                       | 564,600                  | 2,237,646     |
| Washington      | 1,866,245                       | 483,825                  | 2,350,070     |
| West Virginia   | 1,135,746                       | 188,200                  | 1,323,946     |
| Wisconsin       | 2,608,530                       | 551,203                  | 3,159,733     |
| Wyoming         | 1,828,107                       | 188,200                  | 2,016,307     |
| Guam            | 147,067                         | —                        | 147,067       |
| Puerto Rico     | 441,200                         | —                        | 441,200       |
| Virgin Islands  | 147,067                         | —                        | 147,067       |
| Mariana Islands | 147,067                         | —                        | 147,067       |
| Total           | \$88,240,000                    | \$18,820,000             | \$107,060,000 |

## HANDGUN HUNTING BY STATE

**Alabama:** Permit required to carry but legal for hunting. Subject to wildlife management area restrictions.

**Alaska:** Pistols using centerfire cartridges legal for big game. Any handgun may be used for unclassified and small game.

**Arizona:** Any centerfire handgun may be used for big game. Other handguns may be used for small game, predators or nongame species.

**Arkansas:** No minimum caliber but ammunition restricted to same as for rifles. Barrels must be 4" or larger.

**California:** Prohibited for upland game and waterfowl. Allowed for rabbit and squirrel except in L.A. County; .357 Magnum, .41 Magnum legal for bear and wild boar.

**Connecticut:** No handgun larger than .22 caliber for raccoon. Legal for all species except deer.

**Colorado:** Permitted for rabbits, squirrel, turkey (fall) and predators; .45 caliber or larger for deer.

**Delaware:** Not legal for game species but may be used for unprotected wildlife.

**Florida:** Legal for game and nongame animals; rimfire cartridges prohibited for deer and bear.

**Georgia:** Legal for deer, bear and small game. .22 caliber rimfire only for rabbit, squirrel and raccoon. Not legal for turkey. Legal caliber for deer are those with 500 ft/lbs of energy at 100 yards.

**Hawaii:** Prohibited in public hunting areas.

**Idaho:** Legal for hunting game and nongame animals, forest grouse and turkey.

**Illinois:** Prohibited for deer but legal for small game and unprotected wildlife.

**Indiana:** Not legal for deer but may be used for small game or unprotected wildlife. Permit required for transporting in vehicle or on person when off your own property or place of business.

**Iowa:** Permitted for small game, predators and unprotected wildlife.

**Kansas:** Illegal for deer but legal for small game and unprotected wildlife.

**Kentucky:** Permit for small game and predators. Certain handguns permitted for deer.

**Louisiana:** Nothing over .22 caliber on all wildlife management units.

**Maine:** Permitted for big and small game, predators and unprotected wildlife.

**Maryland:** Permitted for hunting small game and predators or unprotected wildlife. .44 Magnum is legal for deer only in counties that allow rifle hunting. Must generate over 1,200 foot-pounds of muzzle energy.

**Massachusetts:** Illegal for big game hunting. Larger than .38 caliber prohibited on all species at night. Otherwise permissible on small game or unprotected species. Permit required for transport in vehicle.

**Michigan:** May be used for small game and deer except prohibited during deer season in south Michigan.

**Minnesota:** Not legal for protected animals including finishing shots, but may be used on predators or unprotected wildlife.

**Mississippi:** Legal for big and small game, predators and unprotected species.

**Missouri:** Deer may be taken using centerfire cartridge which fires an expanding type bullet weighing not less than 125 grains and develops no less than 350 foot pounds of energy at 50 yards. All pistols legal for upland game animals but not birds.

**Montana:** No caliber limitations.

**Nebraska:** Legal calibers for deer only are 144 Magnum, .41 Magnum, .357 Magnum and .44 Special, with Keith Magnum handload and .45 Colt with Keith Magnum handload.

**Nevada:** Legal for big game with 4 inches or more barrel length. May be used with .357 Magnum, .41 Magnum, 144 Magnum or .45 Magnum, and centerfire cartridge of .22 caliber or larger with overall load length of 2 inches or more.

**New Hampshire:** Permitted where rifle hunting is allowed.

**New Jersey:** Not allowed.

**New Mexico:** Centerfire using ammunition with a case length of 1.98 inches or larger.

**New York:** Centerfire used for deer and bear where rifles are permitted and in some areas restricted to shotgun. Certain areas require handguns no less than .35 caliber and no less than 4 inches barrel.



North Carolina: Centerfire handguns for deer and bear where rifles are permitted.

North Dakota: May be used for predators or unprotected wildlife and for big game.

Ohio: Permitted for hunting small game, predators or unprotected wildlife with further restrictions on some wildlife management areas.

Oklahoma: Centerfire handguns chambered for a .24 caliber or larger, 100 grain or heavier, softnose bullet having overall cartridge length of 1¼ inches or larger. Minimum barrel length of 4 inches.

Oregon: Unlawful for some big game and game birds but is permitted for hunting predators, unprotected wildlife and deer, bear or cougar with appropriate tags.

Pennsylvania: Air pistols and automatic, semi-automatic loading pistols unlawful for wild birds or animals. Manually-operated revolvers legal for game.

Rhode Island: Not technically illegal but outlawed for practical purposes by restrictive handgun carrying policy.

South Carolina: Permitted for hunting big game, small game, predators and unprotected wildlife on game management areas only.

South Dakota: For big game must have expanding bullets with energy of 1,000 foot/pounds.

Tennessee: For big game. Revolvers or pistols chambered for and using the following calibers are .357, .41, .44 Magnum, .30 and .357 Herret and must have barrels of 4 inches or more. For small game (except migratory birds) handguns must use .22 caliber, rimfire ammunition. Rifles and handguns using centerfire ammo prohibited for small game on wildlife management areas, but legal for groundhogs and crows except during deer season. Juveniles under 18 may not hunt with handguns.

Texas: Legal, but all rimfire and .22 jetgun and rocket gun prohibited for deer, antelope, elk and aoudad sheep.

Utah: Legal for deer only. Illegal to use handgun with less than 500 foot/pounds of energy at muzzle and has a barrel less than 4 inches long.

Vermont: Permitted where rifle hunting is allowed.

Virginia: May be used for predatory or some nongame mammals and birds if .23 caliber or larger with 300 foot/pounds of energy. Handguns may be used for non-migratory game animals and birds except furbearers.

Washington: Prohibited for elk, deer, mountain sheep, mountain goat, bear and game birds except forest grouse.

W. Virginia: Any .22 caliber handgun, rimfire or centerfire, can be used legally for hunting small game if barrel is at least 4 inches long. To legally carry a handgun, a Class 1-A license (\$5.00) is required in addition to regular hunting license.

Wisconsin: .22 rimfire handguns only may be used for the same purposes as the .22 rimfire rifle.

Wyoming: Legal handguns calibers for trophy game are .41 Remington Magnum, 144 Remington Magnum, 144 Auto Magnum, 145 Winchester Magnum, and .454 Casull.

---

PARENTS OF MURDERED CHILDREN,  
Winfield, Ill., April 29, 1983.

H.R. 6115 (Sponsor Russo).

Hon. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FORTNEY: We wish to express our support for H.R. 6115. Parents of Murdered Children is an organization formed in 1978 out of the needs of 3 such families in Cincinnati, Ohio. The Rev. and Mrs. Robert Hullinger are the Founders, following the murder of their teen-age daughter. POMC is now approx. 40 Chapters throughout the Nation, including Alaska and Canada. New Chapters form each month. To date, we are the only existing Chapter in the State of Illinois. We formed in Nov. 1981, ten months following the murder of our son, Christopher, who was 27, married and the father of a young son, now 10. Parents of Murdered Children are from all walks of life and different ethnic backgrounds. We share a tragedy in common, the murder of a beloved son or daughter. Our children have been murdered and we, the Victim/Survivors have been denied "equal justice under the law". As Victim/Survivors, we are not only denied justice, in many cases we are further victimized by a judicial system which provides all services and benefits to the offender. These services and

benefits funded by our tax-dollars. As the same time, this same judicial system denies and overlooks the Victim/Survivors their most basic rights under the law.

Many victims of a murderer, do not die at the moment they are struck down. They may be hospitalized and linger for days while the attempt to save their lives is sought. An ambulance is needed, and following—the expense of a funeral and the burial. No amount of money, nor any human power can restore our loved ones to us. Nor can they be replaced or restitution made. The monetary is unable to relieve the pain of grief, the sheer anguish suffered in such a loss. We do believe, however, the tax from the sales of guns, rifles, bows and arrows, ammunition etc., should be diverted into funds available to Victims and Victims/Survivors where need is found. This is little enough our Government can do to help those deprived of son, daughter, parent or spouse. To do less, will show an immense lack of compassion. Something our Countrymen have never shown as a People, as a Nation. We urge you to do all within your power in order to pass this much-needed bill.

From the heart,

ROBERT and MARGARET COOMBS,  
*Chapter Leaders, First Illinois Chapter.*

[From the Chicago Southtown Economist, July 25, 1982]

# "NO JUSTICE," MURDER VICTIMS' PARENTS CRY

(By June Altman)

She is a reserved, conservative woman, but when she talks about the murder of her 20-year-old daughter, anger flashes across her face.

She could never go through it again, she says. She has thought about it, and if the tragedy were repeated she knows what she would do.

"I'd go and blow my brains out," she says. "I wouldn't go through that court system again where I'm treated like a criminal myself."

Her words are harsh, but her listeners understand. They are eighteen other people whose children have been murdered. Each has a story to tell about a terrible grief compounded by the frustrations of the American systems of justice.

They are all middle-aged, middle-income middle-Americans, people who never expected anything so horrible to happen to them. They have been stunned.

The group is the local chapter of "Parents of Murdered Children," a national organization started by a Cincinnati couple in 1978. Sadly, the organization is growing rapidly.

Parents join the group looking for support and for ways to change laws that they say protect the criminal more than the victim. They are not lawyers, and they do not know exactly how to go about changing the law.

But they know more deeply than anyone about the need for change. They want stiffer sentences, less coddling of prisoners and more prosecutions.

The July meeting of the Parents of Murdered Children began with each parent giving a brief description of what happened to their child, and some of the problems they've encountered since.

One mother tells how the man who beat and stabbed her 20-year-old son to death was sentenced to a work release program.

"The judge slapped his wrist," she says. She tells of unanswered letters she and her husband wrote to the man's parole review board.

Another mother tells how the man who stabbed her 20-year-old daughter to death was sentenced to 30 years in jail, making him eligible for parole in 15 years. The man holds her and her husband responsible for his imprisonment, and the couple fears for their lives when he is released.

They wish they would be notified when the man is released, but prison officials won't do that for victim's families.

A third mother tells of the anguish she and her family have experienced since the murder of her 27-year-old son in Dec. 1980. No one has been charged with the murder.

The family does not want to let the case drop, but their interest in it has resulted in additional heartaches.

"My husband had to go over to the sheriff's department once a week for a year," the mother said. "Trying to get information was like pulling teeth," she said.

"They saw him as some type of threatening agent, not as a bereaved father. It was like they didn't care. They didn't call us, they didn't want to see us."

The guest at this meeting of Parents of Murdered Children is the assistant warden of Statesville Prison, where one quarter of the inmates are convicted murderers. He has been invited because the parents are interested in prison conditions, something that is no longer an abstract social issue for them.

Salvadore Godinez tells the parents about the many programs the prison offers to teach its prisoners to live in society. He argues that it is important for prisoners to learn such skills.

But the parents aren't buying his arguments. The only equitable sentences for a convicted murderer are capital punishment or life imprisonment, they say.

"If you take a life, you should lose your life," one mother says. "If I steal \$1,000 from you, would you be satisfied if I give you back 50 cents?"

Some of the other parents ask Godinez about conditions at the prison. They want to know whether the prisoners have access to television, and whether the prison is air-conditioned.

The warden replies that the facilities are not air-conditioned, but that some of the prisoners have television sets.

The parents ask about food, and the warden replies that the prison is obligated by law to provide three nutritionally-balanced meals daily.

The answers evoke angry responses from the parents.

One mother whose son was murdered comments, "They have their television. They don't have to work if they don't want to, and they are served three meals a day. That kind of life isn't punishment."

"I'm bitter about the things they're doing for murderers," she says. "Why should we be concerned about them?"

"My son's in a grave. Did anyone ask him whether he wanted to be in a grave?"

The warden is asked about the annual cost of keeping a prisoner at Statesville, and replies that it is about \$11,000.

The figure—low compared to that for other prisons where the annual cost has been estimated as high as \$30,000—disturbs the parents.

"Why should my tax dollars go to support the murderer of my daughter?" one mother asks.

As each parent addresses the group, the grief is immediately obvious. Tears, anger, cracking voices surface as soon as they begin to talk.

One woman confides that her husband has had recurring nightmares since her son's murder. Another parent talks about how his neighbors cross the street when they see him coming, because they don't know what to say.

Participating in Parents for Murdered Children is one part of their struggle to handle what one grieving father describes as "a sentence to a lifetime of hurt and sorrow."

The group gives the parents a chance not only to talk, but to ask each other the questions for which no one yet has an answer.

As the July meeting comes to a close, a father puts forth one of these questions.

"Most of the rights belong to the accused," he says. "The right to counsel, to a proper defense and so on."

"But what about the person who is the victim? Doesn't the victim have any rights?"

The parents nod at each other in sympathy, but the looks on their faces reveal their knowledge that the question remains unanswered.

#### PARENTS HAVE PLACE TO TURN

"Parents of Murdered Children" is a national organization started in 1978 by two grieving parents.

The group collects no dues, and has no religious affiliation.

It holds meetings and puts out newsletters, and more importantly serves as a place to turn for parents faced with one of the most difficult and painful situations imaginable.

"We will write or phone any parent of a murdered child and, if possible, link that parent up with others in the same vicinity who have survived their child's homicide," the group's literature states.

The Chicago-area chapter is one of 30 which have sprung up across the country. It is based in Winfield, a West Suburb located near Wheaton, but is open to anyone who wishes to join.

Members include parents of young children, parents of adult children, and occasionally other relatives of murder victims.

The Winfield chapter was organized by Margaret and Bob Coombs, a couple whose son was murdered in 1980. Mrs. Coombs said they undertook the task because "there is a terrible need to talk when this happens."



"This kind of anguish needs to be shared, needs to be spoken with someone who understands. Sometimes there are no words, but another parent who has gone through the same thing understands," she said.

The Winfield chapter has about 40 members, including the family of Michael Healy, a Hometown police officer who was murdered in 1981 while working as a security guard for the U.S. Post Office.

Attendance at the group's monthly meetings is optional, and varies from a few dozen people to a handful. Brothers and sisters of murder victims sometimes attend the meetings.

Additional information about the Winfield group is available through "Parents of Murdered Children," OS 655 Madison; Winfield, Illinois 60190. The phone number is (312) 668-5857.

Additional information about the national group is available through "Parents of Murdered Children, Inc.," 1739 Bella Vista, Cincinnati, Ohio 45237. The phone number is (513) 242-8025.

---

#### STATEMENT OF THE SPORTING ARMS AND AMMUNITION MANUFACTURERS' INSTITUTE, INC.

The Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute ("SAAMI") is a trade association of sporting arms and ammunition producers. A list of SAAMI's members is attached.

H.R. 2470 would divert the monies raised by the excise tax on pistols and revolvers from the Pittman-Robertson programs into a new Crime Victims Compensation Trust Fund. The sporting arms and ammunition industry has long supported the Pittman-Robertson programs and the use of excise taxes on firearms and ammunition to support those programs. SAAMI opposes H.R. 2470.

The Pittman-Robertson programs were signed into law in September 1937. Initially, they were funded only by the excise tax on long guns and ammunition, and the monies were used to support state wildlife programs. In 1970, the excise tax on handguns also was dedicated to state wildlife programs and to new programs promoting hunter safety. The October 1970 statute authorized state wildlife agencies to use up to one-half of the receipts from the handgun excise tax for hunter education and target range construction and maintenance and the other half for wildlife restoration. A total of \$100 million is raised annually by the excise taxes to support these programs.

The Pittman-Robertson programs have been demonstrably effective. Large quantities of land have been acquired or put under easement by the states and developed to promote wildlife habitat. State research efforts funded by Pittman-Robertson funds have significantly furthered our knowledge of American wildlife and its needs. All citizens benefit from these programs.

The hunter education programs also have been remarkably successful. Approximately 750,000 persons per year attend courses in hunting safety and hunting ethics supported by Pittman-Robertson funds. In many states, despite a great increase in the number of hunters, the number of fatal hunting accidents has declined sharply.

The Pittman-Robertson programs contribute to law enforcement as well. In many communities across the country, local law enforcement agencies utilize target ranges built with Pittman-Robertson revenues.

In sum, the monies raised under the Pittman-Robertson programs have greatly benefitted, and continue to benefit, the entire country, not simply hunters. The members of SAAMI, who directly pay a large part of the excise taxes, have always supported the Pittman-Robertson programs wholeheartedly.

H.R. 2470 would substantially curtail the Pittman-Robertson programs. Nearly one quarter (\$30 million annually) of the funds now allocated to these worthwhile programs would be eliminated. The Pittman-Robertson program and their bases for support should remain intact.

#### SPORTING ARMS AND AMMUNITION MANUFACTURERS' INSTITUTE MEMBERSHIP

Browning Arms Company, Federal Cartridge Corporation, Harrington & Richardson, Inc., Hercules Incorporated, Ithaca Gun Company, O. F. Mossberg & Sons, Inc., Winchester Group Olin Corporation, Remington Arms Company, Inc., Smith & Wesson, Sturm, Ruger & Co., Inc., and Thompson/Center Arms.